arXiv:1702.07045v1 [math.AP] 22 Feb 2017

WEIGHTED L_q-ESTIMATES FOR STATIONARY STOKES SYSTEM WITH PARTIALLY BMO COEFFICIENTS

HONGJIE DONG AND DOYOON KIM

Abstract. We prove the unique solvability of solutions in Sobolev spaces to the stationary Stokes system on a bounded Reifenberg flat domain when the coefficients are partially BMO functions, i.e., locally they are merely measurable in one direction and have small mean oscillations in the other directions. Using this result, we establish the unique solvability in Muckenhoupt type weighted Sobolev spaces for the system with partially BMO coefficients on a Reifenberg flat domain. We also present weighted a priori L_q-estimates for the system when the domain is the whole Euclidean space or a half space.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we continue our study [10] on stationary Stokes system with rough coefficients, where we considered a system in Sobolev spaces whose coefficients are merely measurable in one direction, i.e., they can be very irregular (no regularity assumptions) in one direction. The stationary Stokes system we consider contains a second-order divergence type operator with variable coefficients:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u + \nabla p = f + D_\alpha f_\alpha & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} u = g & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{L}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{L}u = D_\alpha \left(A^{\alpha\beta} D_\beta u \right), \quad A^{\alpha\beta} = [A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}]_{i,j=1}^d \tag{1.2}$$

for $\alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, d$. Throughout this paper, we use the Einstein summation convention on repeated indices. The coefficients $A^{\alpha\beta}$, as functions of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, are bounded and satisfy the strong ellipticity condition. See (2.1).

As mentioned in [10], besides its mathematical interests, such a system is also partly motivated by the study of inhomogeneous fluids with density dependent viscosity (see, for instance, [25, 26, 1]), as well as equations describing flows of shear thinning and shear thickening fluids with viscosity depending on pressure (see, for instance, [17, 5]). It also has a connection to the Navier-Stokes system in general Riemannian manifolds. See, for instance, [9]. Since the coefficients are merely measurable in one direction, they may have jump discontinuities and

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35R05, 76N10, 76D07.

Key words and phrases. Stokes system, Reifenberg flat domains, measurable coefficients, small mean oscillations, Muckenhoupt weights.

H. Dong was partially supported by the NSF under agreement DMS-1056737 and DMS-1600593.

D. Kim was supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Ministry of Education (2016R1D1A1B03934369).

hence, the system can be used to model, for example, the motion of two fluids with interfacial boundaries.

In [10], we established a priori L_q-estimates, $q \in [2, \infty)$, for (1.1) when the domain Ω is the whole Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$ or a half space $\mathbb{R}^d_+$ under the assumption that $A^{\alpha\beta}$ are functions of only one variable with no regularity assumptions. We also proved there an L_q-estimate, $q \in (1, \infty)$, and the unique solvability of (1.1) in Sobolev spaces when Ω is a bounded Lipschitz domain with a small Lipschitz constant. In this case, the coefficients $A^{\alpha\beta}$ are assumed to be merely measurable in one direction, which is almost parallel to the normal direction near the boundary, and have small bounded mean oscillations (BMO) in the other directions. This type of coefficients is called (variably) partially BMO coefficients and was first introduced in [23]. See Assumption 2.2. For other previous results on the Stokes system and discussions about the system with variable coefficients, we refer the reader to [18, 16, 19, 10] and the references therein.

In this paper, we generalize the results of [10] in two respects. First, we consider the stationary Stokes system defined on a more general domain, called a Reifenberg flat domain. See Theorem 2.4. The solution spaces are standard Sobolev spaces (without weights) as in [10]. In this study, we not only deal with more general domains, but also clearly identify the classes of coefficients as well as domains for the existence and uniqueness of solutions to the stationary Stokes system in Sobolev spaces. As is shown, for instance, in [21], even the Poisson equation on a Lipschitz domain may not be solvable in $W^1_q(\Omega)$ with $q > 3$ ($q > 4$ if $d = 2$) unless the boundary is sufficiently flat. Likewise, if coefficients $A^{\alpha\beta}$ are in the class of partially BMO functions, the sizes of the mean oscillations of $A^{\alpha\beta}$ on small balls need to be sufficiently small. Indeed, suppose that both quantities (the flatness and the mean oscillations) are bounded by a positive number ρ. Then, in elliptic and parabolic cases with partially BMO coefficients on Reifenberg flat domains (see, for instance, [11]), there exists a unique solution to a given equation in a Sobolev space if ρ is sufficiently small. It is important that the size of ρ is determined only by parameters such as the dimension, the ellipticity constant, and q if solutions are to be found in a L_q-based Sobolev space. In the case of the Stokes system, it is more involved to determine ρ because of the divergence equation $\operatorname{div} u = g$. Here, we clarify the dependence of ρ, which amounts to identifying possible coefficients and domains for our main results. See Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, and Remark 2.3. It is worth noting that in a recent work [7], an a priori estimate of solutions was proved for the stationary Stokes system on a Reifenberg flat domain, and the solvability was mentioned for Lipschitz domains, when the coefficients have small mean oscillations with respect to *all* the variables.

Second, we extend the results in [10] to the framework of Sobolev spaces with weights (see Theorem 2.6), under the same regularity assumptions on the coefficients and the boundary of the domain as in the unweighted case (see Theorem 2.4). We consider Muckenhoupt weights, $\omega \in A_q$, $q \in (1, \infty)$, which are defined on the same domain as the Stokes system. See (2.5). In a recent work [6], the authors studied the stationary Stokes system in Sobolev spaces having BMO coefficients as in [7]. They considered Muckenhoupt weights in $A_{q/2}$ with $q \in (2, \infty)$ defined in the whole Euclidean space. Owing to the fact that $A_{q/2} \subsetneq A_q$ and considering the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function theorem with A_q weights, our results are sharp in the sense that we allow A_q weights in obtaining L_q-estimates for any $q \in (1, \infty)$.

Moreover, we consider weights defined on domains, which might be more general as the restriction of a Muckenhoupt weight in $\mathbb{R}^d$ to a domain with an exterior measure condition, like a Reifenberg flat domain, results in a Muckenhoupt weight on the domain. We remark that we also deal with the stationary Stokes system defined in the whole Euclidean space and on a half space using Muckenhoupt weights, while, as mentioned above, in [10] we only treated this case for $q \in [2, \infty)$ without weights. See Theorem 2.6.

The regularity assumptions in this paper on coefficients and domains have also been considered in recent papers, [12, 11] for instance, on elliptic and parabolic equations/systems. In particular, as far as coefficients are concerned, the assumption allowing coefficients to be merely measurable in one direction cannot be relaxed in view of the counterexamples about the unique solvability of elliptic equations in Sobolev spaces (see [28, 15]) when the coefficients are only measurable functions of two variables. See [11] and the references therein for a comprehensive study on elliptic and parabolic equations/systems in Sobolev space with Muckenhoupt weights.

To prove our main results, we take two different approaches to the unweighted and weighted cases. When dealing with the stationary Stokes system in Sobolev spaces without weights, we use a level-set type of argument as used in [12] to obtain a desired L_q-estimate. In short, by measuring the level sets of a solution in L_2, we show that the solution is indeed in L_q, $q > 2$, if the terms on the right-hand side of the system are in L_q. Since the solution is not known to be in L_q a priori, the main ingredient of the proof is a reverse Hölder's inequality, for which we utilize the L_2-estimate of the Stokes system accompanied by that of the divergence equation. Thus, when determining the size of ρ later (see Assumption 2.2), we need to take into consideration the constant in the L_2-estimate for the divergence equation, which may carry some information about the domain of the system. See the proof of Lemma 3.5 and Remark 3.6.

For the proofs of the main results for Sobolev spaces with weights, we make use of the mean oscillation estimate approach presented, for instance, in [13, 12, 11]. As explained in [13], mean oscillation estimates are well suited to the perturbation argument for coefficients having small mean oscillations. Moreover, as shown in [11], they are in an appropriate form to deal with L_q-estimates with Muckenhoupt weights via the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function theorem and the Fefferman-Stein theorem on sharp functions, which are valid for L_q spaces with Muckenhoupt weights. The mean oscillation estimates rely on Theorem 2.4, which is for the unweighted case. Hence, this cannot be considered as a simple consequence of our main results for the weighted case, in particular, Theorem 2.7 with the weight $\omega \equiv 1$.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. We state the main results of this paper along with some notation description and assumptions in the following section. In Section 3, we prove reverse Hölder's inequality for solutions in L_2 to the Stokes system with general coefficients. In Section 4, we prove interior and boundary L_∞ and Hölder estimates for derivatives of solutions when the system has coefficients measurable in one direction. Using the results obtained in the previous sections, we prove the existence and uniqueness of solutions together with L_q-estimates to the Stokes system defined on a Reifenberg flat domain with partially BMO coefficients in Section 5. The solution spaces here are Sobolev spaces without

weights. Finally, we devote Section 6 to the proofs of Theorems 2.6 and 2.7, which are for Sobolev spaces with Muckenhoupt weights.

2. Main results

Before we present our main results, we introduce some notation used throughout the paper and state the assumptions for our main theorems. We fix a half space to be $\mathbb{R}^d_+$, defined by

$$\mathbb{R}^d_+ = \{x = (x_1, x') \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 > 0,\, x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}\}.$$

Let $B_r(x_0)$ be an Euclidean ball of radius r in $\mathbb{R}^d$ centered at $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and let $B_r^+(x_0)$ be the half ball

$$B_r^+(x_0) = B_r(x_0) \cap \mathbb{R}^d_+.$$

A ball in $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ is denoted by

$$B'_r(x') = \{y' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} : |x' - y'| < r\}.$$

We use the abbreviations $B_r := B_r(0)$, $B_r^+ := B_r^+(0)$ where $0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $B'_r := B'_r(0)$ where $0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. We also denote

$$(f)_{\mathcal{D}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|}\int_{\mathcal{D}} f\,dx = \fint_{\mathcal{D}} f\,dx,$$

$$\Omega_r(x_0) = \Omega \cap B_r(x_0).$$

Throughout the paper, the coefficients $A^{\alpha\beta}$ are assumed to be bounded and satisfy the strong ellipticity condition, i.e., there exists a constant $\delta \in (0,1)$ such that

$$|A^{\alpha\beta}| \le \delta^{-1}, \quad \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{d} \xi_\alpha \cdot A^{\alpha\beta}\xi_\beta \ge \delta \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d} |\xi_\alpha|^2 \tag{2.1}$$

for any $\xi_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, d$.

We say that $(u, p) \in W^1_q(\Omega)^d \times L_q(\Omega)$ is a solution to (1.1) if we have

$$-\int_\Omega D_\alpha \psi \cdot A^{\alpha\beta} D_\beta u\,dx - \int_\Omega p\ \mathrm{div}\,\psi\,dx = \int_\Omega f \cdot \psi\,dx - \int_\Omega f_\alpha \cdot D_\alpha \psi\,dx$$

for any $\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_d) \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)^d$, where

$$\mathrm{div}\,\psi = D_1\psi_1 + \ldots + D_d\psi_d \quad \text{and} \quad D_\alpha \psi = (D_\alpha\psi_1, D_\alpha\psi_2, \dots, D_\alpha\psi_d).$$

We assume that Ω is a Reifenberg flat domain in the following sense.

Assumption 2.1. There exists $R_0 \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $0 < r \le R_0$, there is a coordinate system depending on x_0 and r such that in the new coordinate system we have

$$\left\{(y_1, y') : x_{01} + \frac{r}{16} < y_1\right\} \cap B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega_r(x_0) \subset \left\{(y_1, y') : x_{01} - \frac{r}{16} < y_1\right\} \cap B_r(x_0),$$

where x_{01} is the first coordinate of x_0 in the new coordinate system.

Next, we state our assumption on the regularity of the coefficients $A^{\alpha\beta}$ combined with the flatness of $\partial\Omega$. Let $\rho \in (0, 1/16)$ be a small constant to be specified later.

Assumption 2.2 (ρ)**.** There exists $R_1 \in (0, R_0]$ satisfying the following.
(i) For $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $0 < r \le \min\{R_1, \operatorname{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega)\}$, there is a coordinate system depending on x_0 and r such that in this new coordinate system we have

$$\fint_{B_r(x_0)} \left| A^{\alpha\beta}(x_1, x') - \fint_{B_r'(x_0')} A^{\alpha\beta}(x_1, z')\, dz' \right| dx \le \rho. \tag{2.2}$$

(ii) For any $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $0 < r \le R_1$, there is a coordinate system depending on x_0 and r such that in the new coordinate system (2.2) holds, and

$$\{(y_1, y') : x_{01} + \rho r < y_1\} \cap B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega_r(x_0) \subset \{(y_1, y') : x_{01} - \rho r < y_1\} \cap B_r(x_0),$$

where x_{01} is the first coordinate of x_0 in the new coordinate system.

Remark 2.3. Clearly, Assumption 2.2 is stronger than Assumption 2.1. The reason we state these two assumptions separately is the following. Owing to the role of the divergence equation in Stokes systems, in the main theorems below, ρ is determined by a set of parameters including the boundary flatness and R_0 in Assumption 2.1. Without Assumption 2.1, the size of ρ needs to be chosen only using the information in Assumption 2.2, which may lead to a circular reasoning. For instance, even if $A^{\alpha\beta}$ are uniformly continuous, they may not satisfy (2.2) for a pair of R_1 and ρ if ρ is given by R_1. With two assumptions as above, uniformly continuous coefficients satisfy the condition (2.2) for any given ρ by choosing a sufficiently small R_1.

Our first result is the L_q-estimate for the Stokes system.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $q, q_1 \in (1, \infty)$ satisfy $q_1 \ge qd/(q+d)$, $K > 0$, and let Ω be bounded with $\operatorname{diam}\Omega \le K$. Then, there exists a constant $\rho = \rho(d, \delta, R_0, K, q) \in (0, 1/16)$ such that, under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 (ρ), for $(u, p) \in W^1_q(\Omega)^d \times L_q(\Omega)$ satisfying $(p)_\Omega = 0$ and*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u + \nabla p = f + D_\alpha f_\alpha & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} u = g & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

where $f \in L_{q_1}(\Omega)$, $f_\alpha, g \in L_q(\Omega)$, we have

$$\|Du\|_{L_q(\Omega)} + \|p\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \le N \left(\|f\|_{L_{q_1}(\Omega)} + \|f_\alpha\|_{L_q(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \right), \tag{2.4}$$

where $N > 0$ is a constant depending only on d, δ, R_0, R_1, K, q, and q_1. Moreover, for $f \in L_{q_1}(\Omega)$, $f_\alpha, g \in L_q(\Omega)$ with $(g)_\Omega = 0$, there exists a unique $(u, p) \in W^1_q(\Omega)^d \times L_q(\Omega)$ satisfying $(p)_\Omega = 0$ and (2.3).

Remark 2.5. Theorem 2.4 states that the choice of ρ depends not only on d, δ, and q, but also on R_0 and K. Indeed, in the proof of Theorem 2.4 the constant ρ is determined by a set of parameters including K_1. The latter, in turn, is given by d, R_0, and K through the L_2-estimate for divergence equations on John domains. See Assumption 3.1 and Remark 3.3 below.

We also consider the Stokes system in weighted spaces with Muckenhoupt weights. To this end, we introduce some additional notation. For any $q \in (1, \infty)$, let $A_q = A_q(\Omega)$ be the set of all nonnegative $L_{1,\mathrm{loc}}$ functions ω on Ω such that

$$[\omega]_{A_q} := \sup_{x_0 \in \Omega, r > 0} \left(\fint_{\Omega_r(x_0)} \omega(x)\, dx \right) \left(\fint_{\Omega_r(x_0)} \big(\omega(x)\big)^{-1/(q-1)}\, dx \right)^{q-1} < \infty. \tag{2.5}$$

We write $f \in L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)$ if

$$\int_\Omega |f|^q \omega \, dx < \infty.$$

We also use $\omega(\cdot)$ to denote the measure $\omega(dx) = \omega \, dx$, i.e., for $A \subset \Omega$,

$$\omega(A) = \int_A \omega(x) \, dx.$$

We use the following weighted Sobolev spaces,

$$W^1_{q,\omega}(\Omega) = W^1_q(\Omega, \omega \, dx) = \{u : u, Du \in L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)\}.$$

The next theorem is a generalization of [10, Theorem 2.1], in which a unweighted L_q-estimate with $q \geq 2$ was obtained.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $q \in (1, \infty)$, Ω be either $\mathbb{R}^d$ or $\mathbb{R}^d_+$, $A^{\alpha\beta} = A^{\alpha\beta}(x_1)$, and $\omega \in A_q(\Omega)$. If $(u, p) \in W^1_{q,\omega}(\Omega)^d \times L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)$ satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u + \nabla p = D_\alpha f_\alpha & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} u = g & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \quad \text{in case } \Omega = \mathbb{R}^d_+, \end{cases}$$

where $f_\alpha, g \in L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)$, then we have

$$\|Du\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)} + \|p\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)} \leq N \left(\|f_\alpha\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)} \right), \tag{2.6}$$

where $N = N(d, \delta, q, [\omega]_{A_q})$.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $q \in (1, \infty)$ and $K > 0$ be constants, Ω be bounded with $\operatorname{diam} \Omega \leq K$, and $\omega \in A_q(\Omega)$. Then, there exists a constant*

$$\rho = \rho(d, \delta, R_0, K, q, [\omega]_{A_q}) \in (0, 1/16)$$

such that, under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 (ρ), for $(u, p) \in W^1_{q,\omega}(\Omega)^d \times L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)$ satisfying $(p)_\Omega = 0$ and

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u + \nabla p = D_\alpha f_\alpha & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} u = g & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

where $f_\alpha, g \in L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)$, we have

$$\|Du\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)} + \|p\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)} \leq N \left(\|f_\alpha\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)} \right), \tag{2.8}$$

where $N > 0$ is a constant depending only on d, δ, R_0, R_1, K, q, $[\omega]_{A_q}$, and $\omega(\Omega)$. Moreover, for $f_\alpha, g \in L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)$ with $(g)_\Omega = 0$, there exists a unique $(u, p) \in W^1_{q,\omega}(\Omega)^d \times L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)$ satisfying $(p)_\Omega = 0$ and (2.7).

Remark 2.8. A mixed norm version of the results in Theorem 2.7 can be easily derived from Theorem 2.7 and a version of the Rubio de Francia extrapolation theorem. See [11].

3. Reverse Höder's inequality

Note that in this section we impose no regularity assumptions on the coefficients $A^{\alpha\beta}$ of the elliptic operator $\mathcal{L}$ in (1.2).

Assumption 3.1. There exists a constant $K_1 > 0$ such that, for any $g \in L_2(\Omega)$ with $\int_\Omega g\,dx = 0$, there exists $Bg \in \mathring{W}^1_2(\Omega)^d$ satisfying

$$\operatorname{div} Bg = g \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \|D(Bg)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \le K_1 \|g\|_{L_2(\Omega)}. \tag{3.1}$$

Remark 3.2. If $\Omega = B_R$ or $\Omega = B_R^+$, it follows from a scaling argument that the constant K_1 depends only on the dimension d. The same result holds when L_2 is replaced by L_q with $q \in (1,\infty)$, in which case the constant also depends on q.

Remark 3.3. If Ω is a bounded Reifenberg flat domain that satisfies Assumption 2.1, then the domain is also a John domain. From the result in [2], we know that the domain Ω satisfies Assumption 3.1 with a constant K_1 depending only on d, R_0, and $\operatorname{diam}(\Omega)$. Indeed, for a bounded domain Ω, we have

Reifenberg flat domains $\subset$ NTA domains $\subset$ uniform domains $\subset$ John domains,

where the first inclusion is proved in [22, Theorem 3.1], and the second and third inclusions follow from the definitions. For the definition of NTA domains, see [22, Definition 2.2] and [29, Definition 2.3]. For (different versions of) definitions of uniform domains (or 1-sided NTA domains), see [29, Definition 2.2] and [4, Definitions 2.12 and 2.14]. In particular, the equivalence of the two different definitions of uniform domains is explained in the paragraph following [4, Definition 2.14]. The inclusion of uniform domains into John domains follows readily if one uses the definitions in [29, Definitions 2.1 and 2.2], where Definition 2.1 is that of John domains.

Note that, in the following two lemmas, we only impose Assumption 3.1 on the domain.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $q_1 \in (1,\infty)$ with $q_1 \ge 2d/(d+2)$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain with $\operatorname{diam}\Omega \le K$ satisfying Assumption 3.1, and $f \in L_{q_1}(\Omega)$, $f_\alpha, g \in L_2(\Omega)$ with $(g)_\Omega = 0$. Then, there exists a unique $(u,p) \in W^1_2(\Omega)^d \times L_2(\Omega)$ with $(p)_\Omega = 0$ satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u + \nabla p = f + D_\alpha f_\alpha & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} u = g & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\|Du\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|p\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \le N_1 \left(\|f_\alpha\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \right) + N_2 \|f\|_{L_{q_1}(\Omega)},$$

where $N_1 = N_1(d,\delta,K_1)$ and $N_2 = N_2(d,\delta,q_1,K_1,K)$. If $q_1 = 2$, $\Omega = B_R(x_0)$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, or $\Omega = B_R(x_0) \cap \mathbb{R}^d_+$, $x_0 \in \partial\mathbb{R}^d_+$, then we have

$$\|Du\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|p\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \le N \left(R\|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|f_\alpha\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \right),$$

where $N = N(d,\delta)$.

Proof. If $f \equiv 0$, the lemma follows from, for instance, [7, Lemma 3.1]. To have a non-zero f, we obtain $w \in W^2_{q_1}(B_R)$ satisfying the Laplace equation $\Delta w = f 1_\Omega$ in $B_R \supset \Omega$ with the zero boundary condition on ∂B_R. Then, we solve the above

Stokes system by replacing the right-hand side $f + D_\alpha f_\alpha$ by $D_\alpha(D_\alpha w + f_\alpha)$, which makes N_2 depend on K and q_1. □

The main objective of this section is to prove a reverse Hölder's inequality for Du and p.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $q_1 \in (1,2)$ with $q_1 \geq 2d/(d+2)$, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain with $\operatorname{diam}\Omega \leq K$ satisfying Assumption 2.1 with a constant K_1 in the estimate* (3.1). *Suppose that $(u,p) \in W_2^1(\Omega)^d \times L_2(\Omega)$ satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u + \nabla p = D_\alpha f_\alpha & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} u = g & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

where $f_\alpha, g \in L_2(\Omega)$. Then we have the following.

(i) For $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $r \in (0, R_0]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &(|Du|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_{r/2}(x_0)} + (|p|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_{r/2}(x_0)} \\ &\leq N(|f_\alpha|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_r(x_0)} + N(|g|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_r(x_0)} + N(|Du|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{\Omega_r(x_0)} + N(|p|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{\Omega_r(x_0)}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where $N = N(d, \delta, q_1, K_1)$.

(ii) The same estimate as in (3.3) *holds for $x_0 \in \Omega$ if $r > 0$ and $r \leq \operatorname{dist}(x_0, \Omega)$. Recall that in this case $\Omega_r(x_0) = B_r(x_0)$.*

Remark 3.6. Since Assumption 2.1 is enforced on $\partial\Omega$, as noted in Remarks 2.5 and 3.3, one can write d, R_0, and $\operatorname{diam}\Omega$ instead of K_1 in the dependency statements of the constants N in Lemma 3.5. However, we keep K_1 to show that it comes from the estimate of the divergence equation.

Proof of Lemma 3.5. Take a cutoff $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B_1)$ satisfying $\eta = 1$ on $B_{1/2}$. Denote $\eta_r(x) = \eta(x/r)$.

Case (i). For any $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $r \in (0, R_0]$, set

$$\hat{u} := \eta_r(\cdot - x_0)u, \quad \hat{p} := \eta_r(\cdot - x_0)p.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $x_0 = 0$. Then, it follows from (3.2) that $(\hat{u}, \hat{p})$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}\hat{u} + \nabla\hat{p} = D_\alpha\hat{f}_\alpha + \hat{f} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div}\hat{u} = \eta_r g + \nabla\eta_r \cdot u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \hat{u} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}_\alpha &= \eta_r f_\alpha + A^{\alpha\beta} u D_\beta \eta_r, \\ \hat{f} &= -D_\alpha\eta_r f_\alpha + A^{\alpha\beta} D_\beta u D_\alpha \eta_r + \nabla\eta_r p. \end{aligned}$$

We can extend $\hat{f}$ to B_r, so that $(\hat{f})_{B_r} = 0$ and $\|\hat{f}\|_{L_2(B_r)}$ is comparable to $\|\hat{f}\|_{L_2(\Omega_r)}$. Indeed, by Assumption 2.1, we have

$$N|B_r| \leq |B_r \setminus \Omega_r| \leq |B_r|,$$

where $N = N(d) \in (0,1)$. Now we set

$$c := -\frac{1}{|B_r \setminus \Omega_r|} \int_{\Omega_r} \hat{f}(x)\, dx$$

and define the extension of $\hat{f}$, still denoted by $\hat{f}$, to be

$$\hat{f}(x) = \begin{cases} \hat{f}(x) & \text{if} \quad x \in \Omega_r, \\ c & \text{if} \quad x \in B_r \setminus \Omega_r. \end{cases}$$

Then, $(\hat{f})_{B_r} = 0$ and

$$\|\hat{f}\|_{L_2(B_r)} \le N(d)\|\hat{f}\|_{L_2(\Omega_r)}.$$

Let $w^i = (w^i_\alpha)^d_{\alpha=1} = (w^i_1, \dots, w^i_d) \in \mathring{W}^1_{q_1}(B_r)^d$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, be a solution (see Remark 3.2) to

$$\operatorname{div} w^i = \hat{f}^i \quad \text{in } B_r$$

satisfying

$$\|Dw^i\|_{L_{q_1}(B_r)} \le N(d, q_1)\|\hat{f}^i\|_{L_{q_1}(B_r)} \le N(d, q_1)\|\hat{f}^i\|_{L_{q_1}(\Omega_r)}. \tag{3.5}$$

By the Sobolev-Poincaré inequality and (3.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|w^i\|_{L_2(B_r)} &\le Nr^{1-d(1/q_1-1/2)}\|Dw^i\|_{L_{q_1}(B_r)} \\ &\le N(d, q_1)r^{1-d(1/q_1-1/2)}\|\hat{f}^i\|_{L_{q_1}(\Omega_r)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

We extend w^i, $i = 1, \dots, d$, to be zero outside B_r. Then, it follows from (3.4) that $(\hat{u}, \hat{p} - (\hat{p})_\Omega)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}\hat{u} + \nabla(\hat{p} - (\hat{p})_\Omega) = D_\alpha(\hat{f}_\alpha + w_\alpha) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} \hat{u} = \eta_r g + \nabla\eta_r \cdot u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \hat{u} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

where $w_\alpha = (w^1_\alpha, \dots, w^d_\alpha)^{\mathrm{tr}}$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, d$. Using integration by parts, we check that

$$\int_\Omega \eta_r g + \nabla\eta_r \cdot u = 0.$$

Now we apply the W^1_2-estimate in Lemma 3.4 to (3.7) and use (3.6) to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D\hat{u}\|_{L_2(\Omega_r)} + \|\hat{p} - (\hat{p})_\Omega\|_{L_2(\Omega_r)} \le N_1\|\hat{f}_\alpha\|_{L_2(\Omega_r)} \\ &\quad + N_2\, r^{1-d(1/q_1-1/2)}\|\hat{f}\|_{L_{q_1}(\Omega_r)} + N_1\|\eta_r g - \nabla\eta_r \cdot u\|_{L_2(\Omega_r)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $N_1 = N(d, \delta, K_1)$ and $N_2 = N(d, \delta, q_1, K_1)$, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D\hat{u}\|_{L_2(\Omega_r)} + \|\hat{p}\|_{L_2(\Omega_r)} \le N_1\|\hat{f}_\alpha\|_{L_2(\Omega_r)} + N_2\, r^{1-d(1/q_1-1/2)}\|\hat{f}\|_{L_{q_1}(\Omega_r)} \\ &\quad + N_1\|\eta_r g - \nabla\eta_r \cdot u\|_{L_2(\Omega_r)} + \|p\|_{L_1(\Omega_r)}|\Omega|^{-1}|\Omega_r|^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since u vanishes on $\partial\Omega$, by the boundary Sobolev-Poincaré inequality,

$$r^{-1}(|u|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_r} \le N(d)(|Du|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{\Omega_r}.$$

Combining the above two inequalities and using Hölder's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &(|Du|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_{r/2}} + (|p|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_{r/2}} \\ &\le N_1(|f_\alpha|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_r} + N_1(|g|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_r} + N_1 r^{-1}(|u|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_r} \\ &+ N_2(|f_\alpha|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{\Omega_r} + N_2(|Du|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{\Omega_r} + N_2(|p|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{\Omega_r} + \frac{|\Omega_r|}{|\Omega|}(|p|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{\Omega_r} \\ &\le N(|f_\alpha|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_r} + N(|g|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_r} + N(|Du|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{\Omega_r} + N(|p|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{\Omega_r}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last N depends only on d, δ, q_1, and K_1. This proves (3.3).

Case (ii). For $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $r > 0$ such that $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega$, we set

$$\hat{u} := \eta_r(\cdot - x_0)\big(u - (u)_{B_r(x_0)}\big), \quad \hat{p} := \eta_r(\cdot - x_0)p.$$

Again, we assume that $x_0 = 0$. Then, $(\hat{u}, \hat{p})$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}\hat{u} + \nabla \hat{p} = D_\alpha \hat{f}_\alpha + \hat{f} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} \hat{u} = \eta_r g + \nabla \eta_r \cdot (u - (u)_{B_r}) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \hat{u} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$\hat{f}_\alpha = \eta_r f_\alpha + A^{\alpha\beta}(u - (u)_{B_r})D_\beta \eta_r,$$
$$\hat{f} = -(D_\alpha \eta_r) f_\alpha + A_{\alpha\beta} D_\beta u D_\alpha \eta_r + \nabla \eta_r p.$$

Note that $(\hat{f})_{B_r} = 0$ by the weak formulation of the equation and the fact that η_r is supported on $B_r \subset \Omega$.

Let $w^i = (w^i_\alpha)_{\alpha=1}^d = (w^i_1, \dots, w^i_d) \in \mathring{W}^1_{q_1}(B_r)^d$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, be a solution (see Remark 3.2) to

$$\operatorname{div} w^i = \hat{f}^i \quad \text{in } B_r$$

satisfying

$$\|Dw^i\|_{L_{q_1}(B_r)} \le N(d, q_1)\|\hat{f}^i\|_{L_{q_1}(B_r)}. \tag{3.9}$$

By the Sobolev-Poincaré inequality and (3.9), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|w^i\|_{L_2(B_r)} &\le N r^{1-d(1/q_1 - 1/2)} \|Dw^i\|_{L_{q_1}(B_r)} \\ &\le N(d, q_1) r^{1-d(1/q_1-1/2)} \|\hat{f}^i\|_{L_{q_1}(B_r)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

We extend w^i, $i = 1, \dots, d$, to be zero outside B_r. Then, it follows from (3.8) that $(\hat{u}, \hat{p} - (\hat{p})_\Omega)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}\hat{u} + \nabla(\hat{p} - (\hat{p})_\Omega) = D_\alpha(\hat{f}_\alpha + w_\alpha) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} \hat{u} = \eta_r g + \nabla \eta_r \cdot (u - (u)_{B_r}) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \hat{u} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.11}$$

where $w_\alpha = (w^1_\alpha, \dots, w^d_\alpha)^{\mathrm{tr}}$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, d$. Now, we apply the W^1_2-estimate in Lemma 3.4 to (3.11) and use (3.10) to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D\hat{u}\|_{L_2(B_r)} + \|\hat{p} - (\hat{p})_\Omega\|_{L_2(B_r)} \le N_1 \|\hat{f}_\alpha\|_{L_2(B_r)} \\ &\quad + N_2\, r^{1-d(1/q_1-1/2)} \|\hat{f}\|_{L_{q_1}(B_r)} + N_1 \|\eta_r g - \nabla \eta_r \cdot (u - (u)_{B_r})\,\|_{L_2(B_r)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $N_1 = N(d, \delta, K_1)$ and $N_2 = N(d, \delta, q_1, K_1)$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D\hat{u}\|_{L_2(B_r)} + \|\hat{p}\|_{L_2(B_r)} \le N_1 \|\hat{f}_\alpha\|_{L_2(B_r)} + N_2\, r^{1-d(1/q_1-1/2)} \|\hat{f}\|_{L_{q_1}(B_r)} \\ &\quad + N_1 \|\eta_r g - \nabla \eta_r \cdot (u - (u)_{B_r})\,\|_{L_2(B_r)} + \|p\|_{L_1(B_r)} |\Omega|^{-1} |B_r|^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The Sobolev-Poincaré inequality shows that

$$r^{-1}(|u - (u)_{B_r}|^2)^{1/2}_{B_r} \le N(d)(|Du|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{B_r}.$$

Combining the above two inequalities and using Hölder's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&(|Du|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{r/2}} + (|p|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{r/2}} \\
&\le N_1(|f_\alpha|^2)^{1/2}_{B_r} + N_1(|g|^2)^{1/2}_{B_r} + N_1 r^{-1}(|u-(u)_{B_r}|^2)^{1/2}_{B_r} \\
&\quad + N_2(|f_\alpha|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{B_r} + N_2(|Du|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{B_r} + N_2(|p|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{B_r} + \frac{|B_r|}{|\Omega|}(|p|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{B_r} \\
&\le N(|f_\alpha|^2)^{1/2}_{B_r} + N(|g|^2)^{1/2}_{B_r} + N(|Du|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{B_r} + N(|p|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{B_r},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last N depends only on d, δ, q_1, and K_1. This proves (3.3) when $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega$. □

The following proposition can be found, for instance, in [20, Ch. V].

Proposition 3.7. *Let $1 < q_0 < q_1$, $\Phi \ge 0$ in a d-dimensional cube Q, and $\Psi \in L_{q_1}(Q)$. Suppose that*

$$\fint_{B_r(x_0)} \Phi^{q_0}\,dx \le N_0\left(\fint_{B_{8r}(x_0)} \Phi\right)^{q_0} + N_0 \fint_{B_{8r}(x_0)} \Psi^{q_0}\,dx + \theta \fint_{B_{8r}(x_0)} \Phi^{q_0}\,dx$$

for every $x_0 \in Q$ and $r \in (0, R_2]$ such that $B_{8r}(x_0) \subset Q$, where R_2 and θ are constants with $R_2 > 0$ and $\theta \in [0,1)$. Then, $\Phi \in L_{\tilde{q},\mathrm{loc}}(Q)$ for $\tilde{q} \in [q_0, q_0+\varepsilon)$ and

$$\left(\fint_{B_r(x_0)} \Phi^{\tilde{q}}\,dx\right)^{1/\tilde{q}} \le N\left(\fint_{B_{8r}(x_0)} \Phi^{q_0}\right)^{1/q_0} + N\left(\fint_{B_{8r}(x_0)} \Psi^{\tilde{q}}\,dx\right)^{1/\tilde{q}}$$

for all $B_{8r}(x_0) \subset Q$, $r < R_2$, where N and ε depend only on d, q_0, q_1, θ, and N_0, and ε satisfies $0 < \varepsilon < q_1 - q_0$.

Lemma 3.8 (Reverse Hölder's inequality)**.** *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain with $\operatorname{diam}\Omega \le K$ satisfying Assumption 2.1 with a constant K_1 in the estimate (3.1). Suppose that $(u,p) \in \mathring{W}^1_2(\Omega)^d \times L_2(\Omega)$ satisfies (3.2), where $f_\alpha, g \in L_{q_1}(\Omega)$, $q_1 > 2$, and $(g)_\Omega = 0$. Then, there exist constants $\tilde{q} \in (2, q_1)$ and $N > 0$, depending only on d, δ, K_1, and q_1, such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(|D\bar{u}|^{\tilde{q}}\right)^{1/\tilde{q}}_{B_r(x_0)} + \left(|\bar{p}|^{\tilde{q}}\right)^{1/\tilde{q}}_{B_r(x_0)} \\
&\qquad \le N\left(|D\bar{u}|^2\right)^{1/2}_{B_{8r}(x_0)} + N\left(|\bar{p}|^2\right)^{1/2}_{B_{8r}(x_0)} + N\left(|\bar{f}_\alpha|^{\tilde{q}}\right)^{1/\tilde{q}}_{B_{8r}(x_0)} + \left(|\bar{g}|^{\tilde{q}}\right)^{1/\tilde{q}}_{B_{8r}(x_0)}
\end{aligned}$$

for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r \in (0, R_0/8]$, where $\bar{u}$, $\bar{p}$, $\bar{f}_\alpha$, and $\bar{g}$ are the extensions of u, p, f_α, and g to $\mathbb{R}^d$ so that they are zero on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega$.

Proof. We fix a constant $q_1 \in (2d/(d+2), 2)$. We first prove that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(|D\bar{u}|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{r/2}(x_0)} + (|\bar{p}|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{r/2}(x_0)} \\
&\le N(|\bar{f}_\alpha|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{4r}(x_0)} + N(|\bar{g}|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{4r}(x_0)} + N(|D\bar{u}|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{B_{4r}(x_0)} + N(|\bar{p}|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{B_{4r}(x_0)} \qquad (3.12)
\end{aligned}$$

for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r \in (0, R_0/4]$, where $N = N(d, \delta, K_1)$. Once this is proved, we apply Proposition 3.7 to obtain the desired estimate.

To prove (3.12), we consider the following three cases:

$$B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega, \quad B_r(x_0) \cap \partial\Omega \ne \emptyset, \quad B_r(x_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega.$$

Case 1: $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega$. In this case, by the second assertion of Lemma 3.5, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(|D\bar{u}|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{r/2}(x_0)} + (|\bar{p}|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{r/2}(x_0)} = (|Du|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{r/2}(x_0)} + (|p|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{r/2}(x_0)} \\
&\le N(|f_\alpha|^2)^{1/2}_{B_r(x_0)} + N(|g|^2)^{1/2}_{B_r(x_0)} + N(|Du|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{B_r(x_0)} + N(|p|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{B_r(x_0)} \\
&\le N(|\bar{f}_\alpha|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{4r}(x_0)} + N(|\bar{g}|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{4r}(x_0)} + N(|D\bar{u}|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{B_{4r}(x_0)} + N(|\bar{p}|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{B_{4r}(x_0)},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $N = N(d, \delta, q_1, K_1)$.

Case 2: $B_r(x_0) \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$. Take $y_0 \in \partial\Omega$ such that $|x_0 - y_0| = \operatorname{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega) \le r$. Then, we see that

$$
B_{r/2}(x_0) \subset B_{3r/2}(y_0) \subset B_{3r}(y_0) \subset B_{4r}(x_0).
$$

Recall that $r \le R_0/8$. By the first assertion of Lemma 3.5 and the fact that $|B_{3r}(y_0)| \le N(d)|\Omega_{3r}(y_0)|$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(|D\bar{u}|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{r/2}(x_0)} + (|\bar{p}|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{r/2}(x_0)} \le N(|D\bar{u}|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{3r/2}(y_0)} + N(|\bar{p}|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{3r/2}(y_0)} \\
&\le N(|Du|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_{3r/2}(y_0)} + N(|p|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_{3r/2}(y_0)} \\
&\le N(|f_\alpha|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_{3r}(y_0)} + N(|g|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_{3r}(y_0)} + N(|Du|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{\Omega_{3r}(y_0)} + N(|p|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{\Omega_{3r}(y_0)} \\
&\le N(|\bar{f}_\alpha|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{4r}(x_0)} + N(|\bar{g}|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{4r}(x_0)} + N(|D\bar{u}|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{B_{4r}(x_0)} + N(|\bar{p}|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}_{B_{4r}(x_0)},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $N = N(d, \delta, K_1)$.

Case 3: $B_r(x_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega$. By the definitions of $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{p}$, the inequality (3.12) trivially holds. □

4. L_∞ and Hölder estimates

In this section, we prove L_∞ and Hölder estimates of certain linear combinations of Du and p, which are crucial in proving our main results. We set

$$
\mathcal{L}_0 u = D_\alpha \left(A^{\alpha\beta}(x_1) D_\beta u \right),
$$

where $A^{\alpha\beta}(x_1) = [A^{\alpha\beta}_{ij}(x_1)]^d_{i,j=1}$ are functions of only $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that we do not impose any regularity assumptions on $A^{\alpha\beta}(x_1)$. In this case, if a sufficiently smooth (u, p) satisfies $\mathcal{L}_0 u + \nabla p = 0$ in $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we see that

$$
D_1 \left(A^{1\beta} D_\beta u + \begin{bmatrix} p \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) = - \sum_{\alpha \neq 1} A^{\alpha\beta} D_{\alpha\beta} u - \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ D_2 p \\ \vdots \\ D_d p \end{bmatrix} \tag{4.1}
$$

in Ω. Set $U = (U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_d)^{\mathrm{tr}}$, where

$$
U_1 = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\beta=1}^d A^{1\beta}_{1j} D_\beta u_j + p, \quad U_i = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\beta=1}^d A^{1\beta}_{ij} D_\beta u_j, \quad i = 2, \ldots, d. \tag{4.2}
$$

That is,

$$
U = A^{1\beta} D_\beta u + (p, 0, \ldots, 0)^{\mathrm{tr}}.
$$

Throughout the paper, we write $DD_{x'}^k u$, $k = 0, 1, \ldots$, to denote $D^\vartheta u$, where ϑ is a multi-index such that $\vartheta = (\vartheta_1, \ldots, \vartheta_d)$ with $\vartheta_1 = 0, 1$ and $|\vartheta| = k + 1$. As usual, we denote by $C^\tau(\Omega)$, $\tau \in (0, 1)$, the Hölder space equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{C^\tau(\Omega)} = \|u\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} + [u]_{C^\tau(\Omega)},$$

where $[u]_{C^\tau(\Omega)}$ is the Hölder semi-norm of u defined by

$$[u]_{C^\tau(\Omega)} = \sup_{\substack{x,y\in\Omega \\ x\neq y}} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^\tau}.$$

First, we prove the following lemma, a version of which was proved in [10] for the case $r = 1$ and $R = 2$. The objective is to ensure that the right-hand sides of the inequalities depend only on $(R - r)$, instead of r or R.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $0 < r < R$ and let ℓ be a constant.*

(i) If $(u, p) \in W_2^1(B_R)^d \times L_2(B_R)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_0 u + \nabla p = 0 & \text{in } B_R, \\ \operatorname{div} u = \ell & \text{in } B_R, \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

then

$$\|Du\|_{L_\infty(B_r)} \le N(R - r)^{-d/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_R)}, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\|p\|_{L_\infty(B_r)} \le N(R - r)^{-d/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_R)} + N(R - r)^{-d/2} \|p\|_{L_2(B_R)}, \tag{4.5}$$

$$[D_{x'} u]_{C^{1/2}(B_r)} + [U]_{C^{1/2}(B_r)} \le N(R - r)^{-(d+1)/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_R)}, \tag{4.6}$$

where $N = N(d, \delta)$.

(ii) If $(u, p) \in W_2^1(B_R^+)^d \times L_2(B_R^+)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_0 u + \nabla p = 0 & \text{in } B_R^+, \\ \operatorname{div} u = \ell & \text{in } B_R^+, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } B_R \cap \partial\mathbb{R}_+^d, \end{cases} \tag{4.7}$$

then

$$\|Du\|_{L_\infty(B_r^+)} \le N(R - r)^{-d/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_R^+)}, \tag{4.8}$$

$$\|p\|_{L_\infty(B_r^+)} \le N(R - r)^{-d/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_R^+)} + N(R - r)^{-d/2} \|p\|_{L_2(B_R^+)}, \tag{4.9}$$

$$[D_{x'} u]_{C^{1/2}(B_r^+)} + [U]_{C^{1/2}(B_r^+)} \le N(R - r)^{-(d+1)/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_R^+)}, \tag{4.10}$$

where $N = N(d, \delta)$.

Proof. We first prove (4.4) and (4.5) when $r = 1$ and $R = 2$. By Lemma 4.3 of [10], we have

$$\|D_{x'} u\|_{L_\infty(B_1)} + \sum_{i=2}^d \|U_i\|_{L_\infty(B_1)} + [U_1]_{C^{1/2}(B_1)} \le N \|Du\|_{L_2(B_2)}, \tag{4.11}$$

where $N = N(d, \delta)$. Then using the relation

$$\operatorname{div} u = \ell,$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D_1 u_1\|_{L_\infty(B_1)} \le |\ell| + N \|Du\|_{L_2(B_2)} \\ &\le N \|\operatorname{div} u\|_{L_2(B_2)} + N \|Du\|_{L_2(B_2)} \le N \|Du\|_{L_2(B_2)}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

From (4.2), we have

$$\sum_{j=2}^{d} A_{ij}^{11} D_1 u_j = U_i - \sum_{j=1}^{d} \sum_{\beta=2}^{d} A_{ij}^{1\beta} D_\beta u_j - A_{i1}^{11} D_1 u_1, \quad i = 2, \dots, d.$$

By the ellipticity condition, $[A_{ij}^{11}]_{i,j=2}^{d}$ is nondegenerate. Hence, using (4.11) and (4.12), we deduce that

$$\|D_1 u_j\|_{L_\infty(B_1)} \le N \|Du\|_{L_2(B_2)} \tag{4.13}$$

for $j = 2, \dots, d$. To estimate the L_∞-norm of p, we use the interpolation inequality

$$\|U_1\|_{L_\infty(B_1)} \le N \|U_1\|_{L_2(B_1)} + N [U_1]_{C^{1/2}(B_1)},$$

the definition of U_1, and (4.11) to obtain

$$\|U_1\|_{L_\infty(B_1)} \le N \|Du\|_{L_2(B_2)} + N \|p\|_{L_2(B_1)}.$$

This inequality, along with the definition of U_1 and (4.11), (4.12), and (4.13) gives

$$\|p\|_{L_\infty(B_1)} \le N \|Du\|_{L_2(B_2)} + N \|p\|_{L_2(B_1)}.$$

From this, (4.11), (4.12), and (4.13), we conclude that (4.4) and (4.5) are satisfied when $r = 1$ and $R = 2$.

To prove (4.4) for general $0 < r < R$, we use a scaling argument. For $x \in B_r$, we see that $B_{(R-r)/2}(x) \subset B_{R-r}(x) \subset B_R$. Then, by using the following scaling with a translation

$$\hat{u}(y) = 2(R-r)^{-1} u\left(\frac{R-r}{2} y + x\right), \quad \hat{p}(y) = p\left(\frac{R-r}{2} y + x\right) \tag{4.14}$$

and (4.4) for $r = 1$ and $R = 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Du\|_{L_\infty(B_{(R-r)/2}(x))} &\le N(R-r)^{-d/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_{R-r}(x))} \\ &\le N(R-r)^{-d/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_R)}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (4.4) for general $0 < r < R$. Similarly, we obtain (4.5) for general $0 < r < R$.

For the proof of (4.6), see below that of (4.10).

Now, we consider (4.8) and (4.9). By using Lemma 4.4 in [10] and following the same steps as in the proof of (4.4) and (4.5) for the case $r = 1$ and $R = 2$, we obtain (4.8) and (4.9) for $r = 1$ and $R = 2$. For general $0 < r < R$, let $x = (x_1, x') \in B_r^+$. We consider two cases: $x_1 \ge (R-r)/2$ and $x_1 < (R-r)/2$.

If $x_1 \ge (R-r)/2$, then $B_{(R-r)/2}(x) \subset B_R^+$. By (4.4) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Du\|_{L_\infty(B_{(R-r)/4}(x))} &\le N(R-r)^{-d/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_{(R-r)/2}(x))} \\ &\le N(R-r)^{-d/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_R^+)}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

If $x_1 < (R-r)/2$, it follows that

$$x \in B_{(R-r)/2}^+(0, x') \subset B_{R-r}^+(0, x') \subset B_R^+.$$

Then, we use (4.8) for $r = 1$ and $R = 2$ and a scaling as in (4.14) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|Du\|_{L_\infty(B_{(R-r)/2}^+(0,x'))} &\le N(R-r)^{-d/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_{R-r}^+(0,x'))} \\ &\le N(R-r)^{-d/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_R^+)}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

From (4.15) and (4.16), we arrive at (4.8). We similarly prove (4.9) for general $0 < r < R$.

To prove (4.10), let $x, y \in B_r^+$. We consider two cases: $|x-y| \geq (R-r)/8$ and $|x-y| < (R-r)/8$.

If $|x-y| \geq (R-r)/8$, from the estimate (4.8) it follows that

$$\frac{|D_{x'}u(x) - D_{x'}u(y)|}{|x-y|^{1/2}} + \frac{|U_i(x) - U_i(y)|}{|x-y|^{1/2}} \leq N(R-r)^{-(d+1)/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_R^+)}, \quad (4.17)$$

where $i = 2, \ldots, d$. For U_1, we see that

$$\frac{|U_1(x) - U_1(y)|}{|x-y|^{1/2}} \leq N(R-r)^{-1/2} \|U_1 - c\|_{L_\infty(B_r^+)}$$

for any constant c, where

$$\|U_1 - c\|_{L_\infty(B_r^+)} \leq N \|Du\|_{L_\infty(B_r^+)} + \|p - c\|_{L_\infty(B_r^+)}.$$

Since the system (4.7) is satisfied by $(u, p-c)$ in place of (u,p), from (4.9) with $(u, p-c)$ we have

$$\|p - c\|_{L_\infty(B_r^+)} \leq N(R-r)^{-d/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_R^+)} + N(R-r)^{-d/2} \|p-c\|_{L_2(B_R^+)}.$$

On the other hand, from Lemma 3.5 in [10] with $c = (p)_{B_R^+}$, it follows that

$$\|p - c\|_{L_2(B_R^+)} \leq N \|Du\|_{L_2(B_R^+)},$$

where $N = N(d, \delta)$. Combining the last three inequalities with (4.8), we obtain

$$\frac{|U_1(x) - U_1(y)|}{|x-y|^{1/2}} \leq N(R-r)^{-(d+1)/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_R^+)}, \quad (4.18)$$

provided that $|x-y| \geq (R-r)/8$.

If $|x-y| < (R-r)/8$, we consider two sub-cases: $x_1 \geq (R-r)/4$ and $x_1 < (R-r)/4$. If $x_1 \geq (R-r)/4$, then

$$y \in B_{(R-r)/8}(x) \subset B_{(R-r)/4}(x) \subset B_R^+.$$

Thus, by [10, Lemma 4.3] with a scaling and translation it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &[D_{x'}u]_{C^{1/2}(B_{(R-r)/8}(x))} + [U]_{C^{1/2}(B_{(R-r)/8}(x))} \\ &\leq N(R-r)^{-(d+1)/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_{(R-r)/4}(x))} \leq N(R-r)^{-(d+1)/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_R^+)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

If $x_1 < (R-r)/4$, then

$$x, y \in B^+_{(R-r)/2}(0, x') \subset B^+_{R-r}(0, x') \subset B_R^+.$$

In this case, we use [10, Lemma 4.4] with a scaling and translation to get

$$\begin{aligned} &[D_{x'}u]_{C^{1/2}(B^+_{(R-r)/2}(0,x'))} + [U]_{C^{1/2}(B^+_{(R-r)/2}(0,x'))} \\ &\leq N(R-r)^{-(d+1)/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B^+_{R-r}(0,x'))} \leq N(R-r)^{-(d+1)/2} \|Du\|_{L_2(B_R^+)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

From (4.17), (4.18), (4.19), and (4.20), we conclude (4.10). The lemma is proved. □

The lemma below shows that the estimates in Lemma 4.1 also hold under the assumption that $(u,p) \in W_q^1(B_R)^d \times L_q(B_R)$ or $(u,p) \in W_q^1(B_R^+)^d \times L_q(B_R^+)$, where $q \in (1, \infty)$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $0 < r < R$ and $1 < q < \infty$, and let ℓ be a constant.*

(i) *Let $(u,p) \in W^1_q(B_R)^d \times L_q(B_R)$ satisfy (4.3). Then we have*

$$\|Du\|_{L_\infty(B_r)} \le N(R-r)^{-d}\|Du\|_{L_1(B_R)},$$

$$\|p\|_{L_\infty(B_r)} \le N(R-r)^{-d}\|Du\|_{L_1(B_R)} + N(R-r)^{-d}\|p\|_{L_1(B_R)},$$

$$[D_{x'}u]_{C^{1/2}(B_r)} + [U]_{C^{1/2}(B_r)} \le N(R-r)^{-d-1/2}\|Du\|_{L_1(B_R)},$$

where $N = N(d,\delta)$.

(ii) *Let $(u,p) \in W^1_q(B^+_R)^d \times L_q(B^+_R)$ satisfy (4.7). The same inequalities as in (i) hold with B^+_r and B^+_R in place of B_r and B_R, respectively.*

Proof. We use an iteration argument. It is clear that we can assume $q \in (1,2)$. We only deal with the second assertion. Let

$$r_0 = (R+2r)/3, \quad r_1 = (2R+r)/3,$$

and take a non-negative infinitely differentiable function φ defined on $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ such that it has a compact support in $B'_1 = \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} : |x'| < 1\}$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \varphi\, dx' = 1$. For a sufficiently small $\varepsilon \in (0, (R-r)/3)$, set

$$u^{(\varepsilon)}(x_1,x') = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} u(x_1, x'-y')\varphi_\varepsilon(y')\, dy',$$

$$p^{(\varepsilon)}(x_1,x') = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} p(x_1, x'-y')\varphi_\varepsilon(y')\, dy',$$

where $(x_1,x') \in B^+_{r_1}$ and $\varphi_\varepsilon(y') = \varepsilon^{1-d}\varepsilon(y'/\varepsilon)$. That is, they are the mollifications of (u,p) with respect to the variables $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Note that

$$D(u^{(\varepsilon)}) = (Du)^{(\varepsilon)}, \quad U^{(\varepsilon)} = A^{1\beta}D_\beta u^{(\varepsilon)} + (p^{(\varepsilon)}, 0, \dots, 0)^{\mathrm{tr}}$$

in $B^+_{r_1}$. Since the coefficients of $\mathcal{L}_0$ are functions of only x_1, we see that $(u^{(\varepsilon)}, p^{(\varepsilon)})$ satisfies the equation in (4.7) with $B^+_{r_1}$ in place of B^+_R. We first claim that

$$(u^{(\varepsilon)}, p^{(\varepsilon)}) \in W^1_2(B^+_{r_1})^d \times L_2(B^+_{r_1}). \tag{4.21}$$

Note that, for $i = 0, 1$ and for any non-negative integer k,

$$D_1^i D_{x'}^k u^{(\varepsilon)},\ D_{x'}^k p^{(\varepsilon)} \in L_q(B^+_{r_1}). \tag{4.22}$$

From this and an anisotropic Sobolev embedding theorem (see, for instance, [14, Lemma 3.5]) it follows that

$$u^{(\varepsilon)},\ D_{x'}u^{(\varepsilon)} \in L_2(B^+_{r_1}). \tag{4.23}$$

This together with the relation $\operatorname{div} u^{(\varepsilon)} = \ell$ in $B^+_{r_1}$ shows that

$$D_1 u_1^{(\varepsilon)} \in L_2(B^+_{r_1}). \tag{4.24}$$

Next, by the definition of U_i, $i = 1, \dots, d$, we see that, for any non-negative integer k,

$$D_{x'}^k U_i^{(\varepsilon)} \in L_q(B^+_{r_1}), \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

From (4.22) and the relation (4.1) we also see that for any non-negative integer k,

$$D_1 D_{x'}^k U_i^{(\varepsilon)} \in L_q(B^+_{r_1}), \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

Again by the anisotropic Sobolev embedding theorem, we obtain that

$$U_i^{(\varepsilon)} \in L_2(B^+_{r_1}), \quad i = 1, \dots, d. \tag{4.25}$$

The definition of U_i, $i = 2, \dots, d$, shows that

$$\sum_{j=2}^{d} A_{ij}^{11} D_1 u_j^{(\varepsilon)} = U_i^{(\varepsilon)} - \sum_{j=1}^{d} \sum_{\beta=2}^{d} A_{ij}^{1\beta} D_\beta u_j^{(\varepsilon)} - A_{i1}^{11} D_1 u_1^{(\varepsilon)}, \quad i = 2, \dots, d.$$

By the ellipticity of $A^{\alpha\beta}$, (4.23), (4.24), and (4.25), we have

$$D_1 u_j^{(\varepsilon)} \in L_2(B_{r_1}^+), \quad j = 2, \dots, d.$$

Finally, from the definition of U_1 and the fact that $U_1^{(\varepsilon)}, Du^{(\varepsilon)} \in L_2(B_{r_1}^+)$ shown above, we conclude that

$$p^{(\varepsilon)} \in L_2(B_{r_1}^+).$$

Hence, (4.21) is proved.

Set

$$\Gamma_0 = r_0, \quad \Gamma_m = r_0 + (r_1 - r_0) \sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{1}{2^k}, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots,$$

and denote $\Omega_m = B_{\Gamma_m}^+$. By applying Lemma 4.1 to $(u^{(\varepsilon)}, p^{(\varepsilon)})$ which satisfies (4.21) and (4.7) in Ω_{m+1}, we have

$$\|Du^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_\infty(\Omega_m)} \le N_0 \left(\frac{2^m}{r_1 - r_0} \right)^{d/2} \|Du^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_2(\Omega_{m+1})}, \quad m = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

where N_0 is the constant in Lemma 4.1 that depends only on d and δ. On the other hand, for any $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ we have

$$\|Du^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_2(\Omega_m)} \le \frac{\varepsilon_0}{N_0} \left(\frac{r_1 - r_0}{2^m} \right)^{d/2} \|Du^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_\infty(\Omega_m)} + \frac{N_0}{4\varepsilon_0} \left(\frac{2^m}{r_1 - r_0} \right)^{d/2} \|Du^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_1(\Omega_m)}.$$

By combining the above two inequalities, it follows that

$$\|Du^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_2(\Omega_m)} \le \varepsilon_0 \|Du^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_2(\Omega_{m+1})} + \frac{N}{\varepsilon_0} \left(\frac{2^m}{r_1 - r_0} \right)^{d/2} \|Du^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_1(\Omega_m)},$$

where $N = N(d, \delta)$. We multiply both sides by ε_0^m and make summations with respect to $m = 0, 1, \dots$ to get

$$\|Du^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_2(B_{r_0}^+)} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_0^m \|Du^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_2(\Omega_m)}$$
$$\le \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_0^m \|Du^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_\infty(\Omega_m)} + N(r_1 - r_0)^{-d/2} \|Du^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_1(B_{r_1}^+)} \varepsilon_0^{-1} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (\varepsilon_0 2^{d/2})^m.$$

Take a sufficiently small $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ so that $\varepsilon_0 2^{d/2} < 1$. Then we see that the summations above are all finite and, by removing the same terms from both sides of the inequality, we get

$$\|Du^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_2(B_{r_0}^+)} \le N(r_1 - r_0)^{-d/2} \|Du^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_1(B_{r_1}^+)}, \tag{4.26}$$

where $N = N(d, \delta)$. Similarly, we also obtain

$$\|p^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_2(B_{r_0}^+)} \le N(R - r)^{-d/2} \|Du^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_1(B_{r_1}^+)} + N(R - r)^{-d/2} \|p^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_1(B_{r_1}^+)}.$$

This together with (4.26) and Lemma 4.1 applied to $(u^{(\varepsilon)}, p^{(\varepsilon)})$ implies the desired inequalities in the lemma with $u^{(\varepsilon)}$, $p^{(\varepsilon)}$, and $U^{(\varepsilon)}$ in place of u, p, and U. To finish the proof, we let $\varepsilon \to 0$. Indeed, we check that $Du^{(\varepsilon)} \to Du$ and $p^{(\varepsilon)} \to p$ in $L_1(B_{r_1}^+)$. Then, from the estimates for $(u^{(\varepsilon)}, p^{(\varepsilon)})$, it follows that $\{Du^{(\varepsilon)}\}$ and $\{p^{(\varepsilon)}\}$ are Cauchy sequences in $L_\infty(B_r^+)$, and $\{D_{x'}u^{(\varepsilon)}\}$ and $\{U^{(\varepsilon)}\}$ are Cauchy sequences in $C^{1/2}(B_r^+)$. By letting $\varepsilon \to 0$, we finally obtain the L_∞-estimates for Du and p, and the Hölder semi-norm estimates for $D_{x'}u$ and U. □

5. L_q-estimates for Stokes system

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the elliptic operator from (1.2) and Ω be a bounded Reifenberg flat domain satisfying Assumption 2.1. We consider

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u + \nabla p = D_\alpha f_\alpha & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} u = g & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $f_\alpha, g \in L_q(\Omega)$, $(g)_\Omega = 0$, and $q \in (1, \infty)$.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\rho \in (0, 1/120)$, $q \in (2, \infty)$, and Ω be a bounded domain with $\operatorname{diam}\Omega \le K$. Suppose that $(\mathcal{L}, \Omega)$ satisfies Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 (ρ) with a constant K_1 in the estimate (3.1), and $(u, p) \in W_2^1(\Omega)^d \times L_2(\Omega)$ satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u + \nabla p = D_\alpha f_\alpha & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} u = g & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

where $f_\alpha, g \in L_q(\Omega)$ and $(g)_\Omega = 0$. Then, we have the following.

(i) For $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $r \in (0, R_1/8]$ such that $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega$, there exist

$$(w, p_1), (v, p_2) \in W_2^1(B_r(x_0))^d \times L_2(B_r(x_0))$$

such that $(u, p) = (w, p_1) + (v, p_2)$ in $B_r(x_0)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &(|Dw|^2 + |p_1|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{B_r(x_0)} \\ &\le N\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}}(|Du|^2 + |p|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_{8r}(x_0)} + N(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} + |g|^{2\mu})^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}_{\Omega_{8r}(x_0)}, \qquad (5.2) \\ &\|Dv\|_{L_\infty(B_{r/2})} + \|p_2\|_{L_\infty(B_{r/2})} \\ &\le N(\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} + 1)(|Du|^2 + |p|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_{8r}(x_0)} + N(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} + |g|^{2\mu})^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}_{\Omega_{8r}(x_0)}, \qquad (5.3) \end{aligned}$$

where $N > 0$ and $\mu, \nu > 1$ are constants depending only on d, δ, K_1, and q, and μ satisfies $2\mu < q$ and $1/\mu + 1/\nu = 1$.

(ii) For $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $r \in (0, R_1]$, there exist

$$(w, p_1), (v, p_2) \in W_2^1(\Omega_{r/10}(x_0))^d \times L_2(\Omega_{r/10}(x_0))$$

such that $(u,p)=(w,p_1)+(v,p_2)$ *in* $\Omega_{r/10}(x_0)$ *and*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(|Dw|^2+|p_1|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_{r/10}(x_0)}\\
&\le N\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}}(|Du|^2+|p|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_r(x_0)}+N(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu}+|g|^{2\mu})^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}_{\Omega_r(x_0)}, \qquad (5.4)\\
&\|Dv\|_{L_\infty(\Omega_{r/20}(x_0))}+\|p_2\|_{L_\infty(\Omega_{r/20}(x_0))}\\
&\le N(\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}}+1)(|Du|^2+|p|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_r(x_0)}+N(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu}+|g|^{2\mu})^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}_{\Omega_r(x_0)}, \qquad (5.5)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $N>0$ *and* $\mu,\nu>1$ *are constants depending only on* d, δ, K_1, *and* q, *and* μ *satisfies* $2\mu<q$ *and* $1/\mu+1/\nu=1$.

Proof. Case (i). Without loss of generality, we assume that $x_0=0$. By Assumption 2.2, there is a coordinate system such that

$$
\fint_{B_r}\left|A^{\alpha\beta}(x_1,x')-\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta}(x_1)\right|dx\le\rho, \qquad (5.6)
$$

where

$$
\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta}(x_1)=\fint_{B_r'}A^{\alpha\beta}(x_1,x')\,dx'.
$$

Let $\mathcal{L}_0$ be the elliptic operator with the coefficients $\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta}$.

Recall that for B_r, Assumption 3.1 is satisfied with K_1 depending only on d. See Remark 3.2. By Lemma 3.4, there exists a unique solution $(w,p_1)\in W^1_2(B_r)^d\times L_2(B_r)$ with $(p_1)_{B_r}=0$ satisfying

$$
\begin{cases}
\mathcal{L}_0w+\nabla p_1=D_\alpha\big(f_\alpha+(\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta}-A^{\alpha\beta})D_\beta u\big) & \text{in } B_r,\\
\operatorname{div} w=g-(g)_{B_r} & \text{in } B_r,\\
w=0 & \text{on } \partial B_r,
\end{cases}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\||Dw|+|p_1|\|_{L_2(B_r)}\le N\|f_\alpha+(\bar{A}-A)Du)\|_{L_2(B_r)}+N\|g-(g)_{B_r}\|_{L_2(B_r)}\\
&\le N\|f_\alpha\|_{L_2(B_r)}+N\|\bar{A}-A\|_{L_{2\nu}(B_r)}\|Du\|_{L_{2\mu}(B_r)}+N\|g\|_{L_2(B_r)},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $N=N(\delta,d)$, $1/\mu+1/\nu=1$, $2\mu=\tilde{q}\in(2,\infty)$ is a number from Lemma 3.8 that depends only on d, δ, K_1, and q. We used Hölder's inequality in the last inequality. This together with (5.6), the boundedness of A^{ij} by δ^{-1}, and Lemma 3.8 implies (5.2). Here, we use the fact that $r\le R_1/8\le R_0/8$ and inequalities such as $(|D\bar{u}|^2)^{1/2}_{B_{8r}}\le(|Du|^2)^{1/2}_{\Omega_{8r}}$, where $\bar{u}$ is the zero extension of u outside Ω.

Now, set $(v,p_2)=(u,p)-(w,p_1)$, which satisfies

$$
\begin{cases}
\mathcal{L}_0v+\nabla p_2=0 & \text{in } B_r,\\
\operatorname{div} v=(g)_{B_r} & \text{in } B_r.
\end{cases}
$$

Then, by Lemma 4.1 (i) with $r=r/2$ and $R=r$ we have

$$
\||Dv|+|p_2|\|_{L_\infty(B_{r/2})}\le N(|Dv|^2)^{1/2}_{B_r}+N(|p_2|^2)^{1/2}_{B_r},
$$

where $N=N(\delta,d)$. From this, the fact that $(v,p_2)=(u-w,p-p_1)$, and (5.2), we obtain (5.3).

Case (ii). Again, we assume that $x_0=0$. Owing to Assumption 2.2, we can find an orthogonal transformation to obtain

$$
\{(x_1,x'):\rho r<x_1\}\cap B_r\subset\Omega\cap B_r\subset\{(x_1,x'):-\rho r<x_1\}\cap B_r
$$

as well as (5.6).

Take a smooth function χ on $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\chi(x_1) \equiv 0 \quad \text{for } x_1 \le \rho r, \quad \chi(x_1) \equiv 1 \quad \text{for } x_1 \ge 2\rho r, \quad \text{and} \quad |\chi'| \le 2(\rho r)^{-1}.$$

Let $\hat{u} = \chi u$, which vanishes on $B_r \cap \{x_1 \le \rho r\}$. We see that $(\hat{u}, p)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_0 \hat{u} + \nabla p = D_\alpha \big(f_\alpha + h_\alpha\big) & \text{in } B_r \cap \{x_1 > \rho r\}, \\ \operatorname{div} \hat{u} = \chi g + \chi' u_1 & \text{in } B_r \cap \{x_1 > \rho r\}, \\ \hat{u} = 0 & \text{on } B_r \cap \{x_1 = \rho r\}, \end{cases} \tag{5.7}$$

where

$$h_\alpha = (\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta} - A^{\alpha\beta}) D_\beta u + \bar{A}^{\alpha\beta} D_\beta ((\chi - 1)u).$$

For $\tau \in [0, \infty)$, denote

$$\widetilde{B}_r^+(\tau, 0) = B_r(\tau, 0) \cap \{x_1 > \tau\},$$

where $0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Since $\rho \in (0, 1/120)$, we have

$$\Omega_{r/20} \subset \Omega_{7r/120}(\rho r, 0) \subset \Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0) \subset \Omega_{r/8} \subset \Omega_r \tag{5.8}$$

and

$$\Omega_{r/10} \subset \Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0), \quad \widetilde{B}^+_{7r/120}(\rho r, 0) \subset \widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0) \subset \Omega_{r/8} \cap \{x_1 > \rho r\}. \tag{5.9}$$

By Lemma 3.4, there is a unique solution

$$(\hat{w}, \hat{p}_1) \in W_2^1(\widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0))^d \times L_2(\widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0))$$

satisfying $(\hat{p}_1)_{\widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0)} = 0$ and

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_0 \hat{w} + \nabla \hat{p}_1 = D_\alpha (f_\alpha + h_\alpha) & \text{in } \widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0), \\ \operatorname{div} \hat{w} = \chi g + \chi' u_1 - \big(\chi g + \chi' u_1\big)_{\widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0)} & \text{in } \widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0), \\ \hat{w} = 0 & \text{on } \partial \widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0). \end{cases} \tag{5.10}$$

Moreover, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D\hat{w}\|_{L_2} + \|\hat{p}_1\|_{L_2} \le N\big(\|f_\alpha\|_{L_2} + \|h_\alpha\|_{L_2} + \|\chi g + \chi' u\|_{L_2}\big) \\ &\le N\big(\|f_\alpha\|_{L_2} + \|(\bar{A} - A) Du\|_{L_2} + \|D((\chi - 1)u)\|_{L_2} + \|g\|_{L_2} + \|\chi' u\|_{L_2}\big), \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{L_2} = \|\cdot\|_{L_2(\widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0))}$ and $N = N(d, \delta)$. Since $\chi - 1$ is supported on $\{x_1 \le 2\rho r\}$, Hölder's inequality and (5.6) imply that

$$\|(\chi - 1) Du\|_{L_2(\widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0))} \le N \rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} r^{\frac{d}{2\nu}} \|Du\|_{L_{2\mu}(\Omega_{r/8})}, \tag{5.12}$$

and

$$\|(\bar{A} - A) Du\|_{L_2(\widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0))} \le N \rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} r^{\frac{d}{2\nu}} \|Du\|_{L_{2\mu}(\Omega_{r/8})}, \tag{5.13}$$

where $1/\mu + 1/\nu = 1$ and $2\mu = \tilde{q} \in (2, \infty)$ is a number from Lemma 3.8 depending only on d, K_1, and q. Using Hölder's inequality again with the same μ and ν, along with the fact that χ' is supported on $\{\rho r \le x_1 \le 2\rho r\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi' u\|_{L_2(\widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0))} &\le N \rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} r^{\frac{d}{2\nu}} \|\chi' u\|_{L_{2\mu}(\widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0))} \\ &\le N \rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} r^{\frac{d}{2\nu}} \|Du\|_{L_{2\mu}(\Omega_{r/8})}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

where the last inequality follows from Hardy's inequality, using the boundary condition $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and the observation that

$$|\chi'| \le N(x_1 - \phi(x'))^{-1}$$

for $(x_1, x') \in \Omega_r$. Here, $\phi(x')$ is the largest number such that $(\phi(x'), x') \in \partial\Omega$. Inserting (5.12), (5.13), and (5.14) into (5.11) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\|D\hat{w}\|_{L_2(\tilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r,0))} + \|\hat{p}_1\|_{L_2(\tilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r,0))}\\ \le N\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} r^{\frac{d}{2\nu}} \|Du\|_{L_{2\mu}(\Omega_{r/8})} + N\|f_\alpha\|_{L_2(\Omega_{r/8})} + N\|g\|_{L_2(\Omega_{r/8})}, \quad (5.15)\end{aligned}$$

where $N = N(d, \delta)$. We extend $\hat{w}$ to be zero in $\Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0) \cap \{x_1 < \rho r\}$ so that $\hat{w} \in W^1_2(\Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0))$, and we set

$$w = \hat{w} + (1 - \chi)u.$$

We also set

$$p_1 = \begin{cases} \hat{p}_1 & \text{in } \tilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0), \\ p & \text{in } \Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0) \cap \{x_1 < \rho r\}. \end{cases}$$

By the same reasoning as in (5.12) and (5.14), using (5.8) we have

$$\|D\left((1 - \chi)u\right)\|_{L_2(\Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r,0))} \le N\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} r^{\frac{d}{2\nu}} \|Du\|_{L_{2\mu}(\Omega_{r/8})}$$

and

$$\|p_1\|_{L_2(\Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r,0))} \le \|\hat{p}_1\|_{L_2(\tilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r,0))} + N\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} r^{\frac{d}{2\nu}} \|p\|_{L_{2\mu}(\Omega_{r/8})},$$

where $N = N(d)$. From these inequalities and (5.15), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\|Dw\|_{L_2(\Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r,0))} + \|p_1\|_{L_2(\Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r,0))} \le N\|f_\alpha\|_{L_2(\Omega_{r/8})} + N\|g\|_{L_2(\Omega_{r/8})}\\ + N\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} r^{\frac{d}{2\nu}} \left(\|Du\|_{L_{2\mu}(\Omega_{r/8})} + \|p\|_{L_{2\mu}(\Omega_{r/8})}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $N = N(d, \delta)$. This combined with Lemma 3.8 and the inequality $7r/60 \le 7R_1/60 \le R_0/8$ shows that

$$(|Dw|^2 + |p_1|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r,0)} \le N\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} (|Du|^2 + |p|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_r} + N(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} + |g|^{2\mu})^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}_{\Omega_r}, \quad (5.16)$$

where $(N, \mu) = (N, \mu)(d, \delta, K_1, q)$, $1/\mu + 1/\nu = 1$. Using this inequality, (5.9), and the fact that $|\Omega_{r/10}| \ge N(d)|\Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0)|$ if $\rho < 1/120$, we obtain (5.4).

Next, we define $v = u - w$ $(= \chi u - \hat{w})$ and $p_2 = p - p_1$ in $\Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0)$. In particular,

$$p_2 = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0) \cap \{x_1 < \rho r\}.$$

From (5.7) and (5.10), we see that (v, p_2) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_0 v + \nabla p_2 = 0 & \text{in } \widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0), \\ \operatorname{div} v = \left(\chi g + \chi' u_1\right)_{\widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r,0)} & \text{in } \widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0), \\ v = 0 & \text{on } B_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0) \cap \{x_1 = \rho r\}. \end{cases}$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{D}_1 = \Omega_{r/20} \cap \{x_1 \le \rho r\},\ \mathcal{D}_2 = \Omega_{r/20} \cap \{x_1 > \rho r\},\ \text{and } \mathcal{D}_3 = \widetilde{B}^+_{7r/120}(\rho r, 0).$$

Note that, by (5.8), $\mathcal{D}_2 \subset \mathcal{D}_3$, and $(v, p_2) = (0, 0)$ in $\mathcal{D}_1$. By applying Lemma 4.1 (ii) with $r = 7r/120$ and $R = 7r/60$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\||Dv| + |p_2|\|_{L_\infty(\Omega_{r/20})} = \||Dv| + |p_2|\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{D}_2)} \le \||Dv| + |p_2|\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{D}_3)}\\ &\le Nr^{-d/2}\|Dv\|_{L_2(\widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r,0))} + Nr^{-d/2}\|p_2\|_{L_2(\widetilde{B}^+_{7r/60}(\rho r,0))}.\end{aligned}$$

This together with the equality $(u, p) = (w, p_1) + (v, p_2)$ in $\Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r, 0)$ and (5.16) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\||Dv| + |p_2|\|_{L_\infty(\Omega_{r/20})} &\le N\left(|Du|^2 + |p|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r,0)} + N\left(|Dw|^2 + |p_1|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_{7r/60}(\rho r,0)}\\ &\le N(\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} + 1)(|Du|^2 + |p|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_r} + N(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} + |g|^{2\mu})^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}_{\Omega_r}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the inequality (5.5) is proved. □

Corollary 5.2. *Let $\rho \in (0, 1/320)$, $q \in (2, \infty)$, and Ω be a bounded domain with $\operatorname{diam}\Omega \le K$. Suppose that $(\mathcal{L}, \Omega)$ satisfies Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 (ρ) with a constant K_1 in the estimate (3.1), and $(u, p) \in W^1_2(\Omega)^d \times L_2(\Omega)$ satisfies*

$$\begin{cases}\mathcal{L}u + \nabla p = D_\alpha f_\alpha & \text{in } \Omega,\\ \operatorname{div} u = g & \text{in } \Omega,\\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega,\end{cases}$$

where $f_\alpha, g \in L_q(\Omega)$ and $(g)_\Omega = 0$. Then, for any $x_0 \in \bar{\Omega}$ and $r \in (0, R_1]$, there exist

$$(w, p_1), (v, p_2) \in W^1_2(\Omega_{r/40}(x_0))^d \times L_2(\Omega_{r/40}(x_0))$$

such that $(u, p) = (w, p_1) + (v, p_2)$ in $\Omega_{r/40}(x_0)$ and

$$(|Dw|^2 + |p_1|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_{r/40}(x_0)} \le N\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}}(|Du|^2 + |p|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_r(x_0)} + N(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} + |g|^{2\mu})^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}_{\Omega_r(x_0)},$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\|Dv\|_{L_\infty(\Omega_{r/80}(x_0))} + \|p_2\|_{L_\infty(\Omega_{r/80}(x_0))}\\ &\qquad \le N(\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} + 1)(|Du|^2 + |p|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_r(x_0)} + N(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} + |g|^{2\mu})^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}_{\Omega_r(x_0)},\end{aligned}$$

where $N > 0$ and $\mu, \nu > 1$ are constants depending only on d, δ, K_1, and q, and μ satisfies $2\mu < q$ and $1/\mu + 1/\nu = 1$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x_0 = 0$. We consider the following two cases.

$$B_{r/40} \subset \Omega, \quad B_{r/40} \cap \partial\Omega \ne \emptyset.$$

If $B_{r/40} \subset \Omega$, then by Proposition 5.1 (i) with the fact that $r/40 \le R_1/8$, there exist

$$(w, p_1), (v, p_2) \in W^1_2(B_{r/40})^d \times L_2(B_{r/40})$$

such that $(u, p) = (w, p_1) + (v, p_2)$ in $B_{r/40}(x_0)$ and

$$(|Dw|^2 + |p_1|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{B_{r/40}(x_0)} \le N\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}}(|Du|^2 + |p|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_{r/5}(x_0)} + N(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} + |g|^{2\mu})^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}_{\Omega_{r/5}(x_0)},$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\|Dv\|_{L_\infty(B_{r/80})} + \|p_2\|_{L_\infty(B_{r/80})}\\ &\qquad \le N(\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} + 1)(|Du|^2 + |p|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_{r/5}(x_0)} + N(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} + |g|^{2\mu})^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}_{\Omega_{r/5}(x_0)},\end{aligned}$$

where $N = N(d, \delta)$. These and an inequality similar to those in (5.18) below show the desired inequalities above.

If $B_{r/40} \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$, we find $y_0 \in \partial\Omega$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(0, \partial\Omega) = |y_0|$. Then

$$\Omega_{r/40} \subset \Omega_{3r/40}(y_0), \quad \Omega_{r/80} \subset \Omega_{3r/80}(y_0) \subset \Omega_{3r/4}(y_0) \subset \Omega_r, \tag{5.17}$$

and

$$\frac{|\Omega_{3r/40}(y_0)|}{|\Omega_{r/40}|} \leq N(d), \quad \frac{|\Omega_r|}{|\Omega_{3r/4}(y_0)|} \leq N(d). \tag{5.18}$$

From Proposition 5.1 (ii) with $3r/4$ in place of r it follows that there exist

$$(w, p_1), (v, p_2) \in W_2^1(\Omega_{3r/40}(y_0))^d \times L_2(\Omega_{3r/40}(y_0))$$

such that $(u, p) = (w, p_1) + (v, p_2)$ in $\Omega_{3r/40}(y_0)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
&(|Dw|^2 + |p_1|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_{3r/40}(y_0)} \\
&\qquad \leq N\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} (|Du|^2 + |p|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_{3r/4}(y_0)} + N(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} + |g|^{2\mu})^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}_{\Omega_{3r/4}(y_0)},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|Dv\|_{L_\infty(\Omega_{3r/80}(y_0))} + \|p_2\|_{L_\infty(\Omega_{3r/80}(y_0))} \\
&\qquad \leq N(\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} + 1)(|Du|^2 + |p|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_{3r/4}(y_0)} + N(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} + |g|^{2\mu})^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}_{\Omega_{3r/4}(y_0)},
\end{aligned}$$

where $(N, \mu) = (N, \mu)(d, \delta, K_1, q)$, $1/\mu + 1/\nu = 1$. From the above inequalities, (5.17), and (5.18), we obtain the desired conclusion. □

The maximal function of f in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{M}f(x) = \sup_{x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d, B_r(x_0) \ni x} \fint_{B_r(x_0)} |f(y)|\, dy.$$

Throughout this paper, by $\mathcal{M}(f)$ we mean $\mathcal{M}(fI_\Omega)$ if f is defined on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For $q \in (2, \infty)$, denote

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(s) &= \{x \in \Omega : \left(\mathcal{M}(|Du|^2 + |p|^2)(x)\right)^{1/2} > s\}, \\
\mathcal{B}(s) &= \{x \in \Omega : \rho^{-1/(2\nu)} \left(\mathcal{M}(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} + |g|^{2\mu})(x)\right)^{1/(2\mu)} \\
&\qquad + \left(\mathcal{M}(|Du|^2 + |p|^2)(x)\right)^{1/2} > s\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mu, \nu \in (1, \infty)$ are from Corollary 5.2 satisfying $2\mu < q$ and $1/\mu + 1/\nu = 1$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\rho \in (0, 1/960)$, $q \in (2, \infty)$, and Ω be a bounded domain with $\operatorname{diam}\Omega \leq K$. Suppose that $(\mathcal{L}, \Omega)$ satisfies Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 (ρ) with a constant K_1 in the estimate (3.1), and $(u, p) \in W_2^1(\Omega)^d \times L_2(\Omega)$ satisfies*

$$\begin{cases}
\mathcal{L}u + \nabla p = D_\alpha f_\alpha & \text{in } \Omega, \\
\operatorname{div} u = g & \text{in } \Omega, \\
u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega,
\end{cases}$$

where $f_\alpha, g \in L_q(\Omega)$ and $(g)_\Omega = 0$. Then, there exists a constant $\kappa = \kappa(d, \delta, K_1, q) > 1$ such that the following holds: For $x_0 \in \bar{\Omega}$, if

$$|\Omega_{R/240}(x_0) \cap \mathcal{A}(\kappa s)| > \rho^{\frac{1}{\nu}} |\Omega_{R/240}(x_0)|, \quad R \in (0, R_1], \quad s > 0, \tag{5.19}$$

then we have

$$\Omega_{R/240}(x_0) \subset \mathcal{B}(s).$$

Proof. By scaling and translating the coordinates, we may assume that $s = 1$ and $x_0 = 0$. We prove by contradiction. Suppose that there exists $z_0 \in \Omega_{R/240}$ such that $z_0 \notin \mathcal{B}(1)$. That is, $z_0 \in \Omega_{R/240}$ and

$$\rho^{-1/(2\nu)} \left(\mathcal{M}(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} + |g|^{2\mu})(z_0)\right)^{1/(2\mu)} + \left(\mathcal{M}(|Du|^2 + |p|^2)(z_0)\right)^{1/2} \le 1. \tag{5.20}$$

This implies that, for all $r > 0$,

$$\left(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} I_\Omega + |g|^{2\mu} I_\Omega\right)^{1/\mu}_{B_r(z_0)} \le \rho^{1/\nu} \tag{5.21}$$

and

$$\left(|Du|^2 I_\Omega + |p|^2 I_\Omega\right)_{B_r(z_0)} \le 1. \tag{5.22}$$

By Corollary 5.2, there exist

$$(w, p_1), (v, p_2) \in W^1_2(\Omega_{R/40}(z_0))^d \times L_2(\Omega_{R/40}(z_0))$$

such that $(u, p) = (w, p_1) + (v, p_2)$ in $\Omega_{R/40}(z_0)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}&(|Dw|^2 + |p_1|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_{R/40}(z_0)} \\ &\qquad \le N\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} (|Du|^2 + |p|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_R(z_0)} + N(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} + |g|^{2\mu})^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}_{\Omega_R(z_0)},\end{aligned} \tag{5.23}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\|Dv\|_{L_\infty(\Omega_{R/80}(z_0))} + \|p_2\|_{L_\infty(\Omega_{R/80}(z_0))} \\ &\qquad \le N(\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} + 1)(|Du|^2 + |p|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_R(z_0)} + N(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} + |g|^{2\mu})^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}_{\Omega_R(z_0)},\end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

where $N = N(d, \delta, K_1, q)$. It follows from (5.23), (5.21), and (5.22) that

$$(|Dw|^2 + |p_1|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\Omega_{R/40}(z_0)} \le N\rho^{\frac{1}{2\nu}}. \tag{5.25}$$

Next we show that for sufficiently large $\kappa > 0$, that depends only on d, K_1, and q, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\{\mathcal{M}(|Du|^2 + |p|^2) > \kappa^2\} \cap \Omega_{R/240} \\ &\qquad \subset \left\{\mathcal{M}\left(|Dw|^2 I_{\Omega_{R/80}(z_0)} + |p_1|^2 I_{\Omega_{R/80}(z_0)}\right) > \kappa^2/3\right\} \cap \Omega_{R/240}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

To prove this, let y be a point belonging to

$$\left\{\mathcal{M}\left(|Dw|^2 I_{\Omega_{R/80}(z_0)} + |p_1|^2 I_{\Omega_{R/80}(z_0)}\right) \le \kappa^2/3\right\} \cap \Omega_{R/240}. \tag{5.27}$$

By the triangle inequality, we have $B_r(y) \cap \Omega \subset \Omega_{r+R/120}(z_0)$. For $r \ge R/240$, by (5.22),

$$\begin{aligned}&\fint_{B_r(y)} (|Du|^2 + |p|^2) I_\Omega \le \frac{1}{|B_r(y)|} \int_{B_{r+R/120}(z_0)} (|Du|^2 + |p|^2) I_\Omega \\ &\le \frac{|B_{r+R/120}(z_0)|}{|B_r(y)|} = \left(\frac{r + R/120}{r}\right)^d \le 3^d.\end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

For $r < R/240$, by the triangle inequality, we have $\Omega_r(y) \subset \Omega_{R/80}(z_0)$. Since (5.27) means that

$$\fint_{B_r(y)} |Dw|^2 I_{\Omega_{R/80}(z_0)} + |p_1|^2 I_{\Omega_{R/80}(z_0)}\, dz \le \kappa^2/3$$

for any $r > 0$, we have

$$\fint_{B_r(y)} \left(|Du|^2 + |p|^2\right) I_\Omega = \fint_{B_r(y)} \left(|Du|^2 + |p|^2\right) I_{\Omega_r(y)}$$
$$\leq 2 \fint_{B_r(y)} |Dw|^2 I_{\Omega_{R/80}(z_0)} + |p_1|^2 I_{\Omega_{R/80}(z_0)} + (|Dv|^2 + |p_2|^2) I_{\Omega_{R/80}(z_0)}$$
$$\leq 2\kappa^2/3 + 2 \fint_{B_r(y)} (|Dv|^2 + |p_2|^2) I_{\Omega_{R/80}(z_0)}. \tag{5.29}$$

By (5.24), on $\Omega_r(y) \subset \Omega_{R/80}(z_0)$, we have

$$|Dv|^2 + |p_2|^2 \leq N(\rho^{\frac{1}{\nu}} + 1)(|Du|^2 + |p|^2)_{\Omega_R(z_0)} + N(|f_\alpha|^{2\mu} + |g|^{2\mu})^{\frac{1}{\mu}}_{\Omega_R(z_0)}.$$

From this, (5.29), and (5.20), it follows that

$$\frac{1}{|B_r(y)|} \int_{B_r(x)} \left(|Du|^2 + |p|^2\right) I_\Omega \leq 2\kappa^2/3 + N_1, \tag{5.30}$$

where $N_1 = N_1(d, \delta, K_1, q)$. From (5.30) and (5.28), we arrive at (5.26) provided that $\kappa^2 \geq \max\{3^d, 3N_1\}$.

Now by (5.26), (5.25), and the Hardy-Littlewood inequality, we see that

$$|\{\mathcal{M}(|Du|^2 + |p|^2) > \kappa^2\} \cap \Omega_{R/240}| \leq \frac{N}{\kappa^2/3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |Dw|^2 I_{\Omega_{R/80}(z_0)} + |p_1|^2 I_{\Omega_{R/80}(z_0)}$$
$$\leq \frac{N\rho^{1/\nu} |\Omega_{R/40}(z_0)|}{\kappa^2/3} \leq \rho^{1/\nu} |\Omega_{R/240}|,$$

provided that κ is sufficiently large depending only on d, δ, K_1, and q. This contracts the assumption (5.19). The lemma is proved. □

We are now ready to complete the proof of Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. We may assume that $f \equiv 0$. Indeed, for $B_R \supset \Omega$, we find $w \in W^2_{q_1}(B_R)$ such that $\Delta w = f 1_\Omega$ in B_R and $w|_{\partial B_R} = 0$. Then, we consider

$$\mathcal{L}u + \nabla p = D_\alpha \left(D_\alpha w + f_\alpha\right),$$

for which from the Sobolev embedding theorem and the well-known L_{q_1}-estimate for the Laplace equation we have

$$\|D_\alpha w\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \leq \|D_\alpha w\|_{L_q(B_R)} \leq N \|w\|_{W^2_{q_1}(B_R)} \leq N \|f\|_{L_{q_1}(\Omega)}.$$

Also, owing to Lemma 3.4, we only need to consider the case when $q \neq 2$.

Case 1: $q > 2$. Note that Ω is bounded and, owing to Assumption 2.2 (also see Remark 3.3), satisfies Assumption 3.1 with $K_1 = K_1(d, R_0, K)$. Thus by Lemma 3.4, there exists a unique solution $(u, p) \in W^1_2(\Omega)^d \times L_2(\Omega)$. We prove that this (u, p) is indeed in $W^1_q(\Omega)^d \times L_q(\Omega)$ and satisfies (2.4).

Let $\kappa = \kappa(d, \delta, K_1, q)$ be the constant in Lemma 5.3. Then, for any $s > 0$, by the Hardy-Littlewood inequality,

$$|\mathcal{A}(\kappa s)| \leq N_0 (\kappa s)^{-2} \||Du|^2 + p^2\|_{L_1(\Omega)} \leq N_0 (\kappa s)^{-2} \left(\|Du\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|p\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)}\right), \tag{5.31}$$

where $N_0 = N_0(d)$. From (5.31), Lemma 5.3, and a result from measure theory on the "crawling of ink spots," which can be found in [30] or [24, Section 2], we have the following upper bound of $\mathcal{A}$. For any

$$\rho \in (0, 1/960) \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa s \geq N_0^{1/2} \rho^{-1/(2\nu)} |B_{R_1/240}|^{-1/2} \left(\|Du\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|p\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)}\right)^{1/2},$$

we have

$$|\mathcal{A}(\kappa s)| \le N(d)\rho^{1/\nu}|\mathcal{B}(s)|. \tag{5.32}$$

Recall the elementary identity

$$\|f\|^q_{L_q(\Omega)} = q\int_0^\infty |\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > s\}|s^{q-1}\,ds. \tag{5.33}$$

By using (5.31) when

$$\kappa s \in \Big(0, N_0^{1/2}\rho^{-1/(2\nu)}|B_{R_1/240}|^{-1/2}\big(\|Du\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|p\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)}\big)^{1/2}\Big)$$

and (5.32) otherwise, we get for any sufficiently large $S > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{\kappa S} |\mathcal{A}(s)|s^{q-1}\,ds = \int_0^S |\mathcal{A}(\kappa s)|\kappa^q s^{q-1}\,ds\\
&\le N\rho^{(2-q)/(2\nu)}\big(\|Du\|^q_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|p\|^q_{L_2(\Omega)}\big) + N\rho^{1/\nu}\int_0^S \mathcal{B}(s)s^{q-1}\,ds\\
&\le N_1\rho^{(2-q)/(2\nu)}\big(\|Du\|^q_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|p\|^q_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|f_\alpha\|^q_{L_q(\Omega)} + \|g\|^q_{L_q(\Omega)}\big)\\
&\quad + N_2\rho^{1/\nu}\int_0^S |\mathcal{A}(s)|s^{q-1}\,ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.34}$$

where we used the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function theorem in the last inequality (recall $q > 2\mu$), and N_2 depends only on d, δ, K_1, and q, and N_1 depends also on R_1. Note that since Ω is bounded, we have

$$\int_0^{\kappa S} |\mathcal{A}(s)|s^{q-1}\,ds < \infty.$$

Then by replacing S by κS in the last integral in (5.34) and taking ρ sufficiently small depending on d, δ, K_1, and q, we obtain from (5.34) that

$$\int_0^{\kappa S} |\mathcal{A}(s)|s^{q-1}\,ds \le N\big(\|Du\|^q_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|p\|^q_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|f_\alpha\|^q_{L_q(\Omega)} + \|g\|^q_{L_q(\Omega)}\big),$$

where N depends only on d, δ, K_1, q, and R_1. Now, let $S \to \infty$, and use the identity (5.33) and Lemma 3.4 to obtain

$$\|\mathcal{M}(|Du|^2 + |p|^2)\|^{q/2}_{L_{q/2}(\Omega)} \le N\|f_\alpha\|^q_{L_q(\Omega)} + N\|g\|^q_{L_q(\Omega)},$$

where $N = N(d, \delta, R_1, K_1, K, q)$. From this, we finally see that (u, p) is in $W^1_q(\Omega)^d \times L_q(\Omega)$ and satisfies (2.4) because by Lebesgue differentiation theorem

$$|Du|^2 + |p|^2 \le \mathcal{M}(|Du|^2 + |p|^2)$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$.

Case 2: $q \in (1, 2)$. First we prove (2.4) by using a duality argument. Let $q' = q/(q-1) \in (2, \infty)$ and $\rho = \rho(d, \delta, K_1, q')$ from Case 1. Then, for any $\eta = (\eta_\alpha)$, where $\eta_\alpha \in L_{q'}(\Omega)^d$ for $\alpha = 1, \dots, d$, and any $h \in L_{q'}(\Omega)$, there exists a unique solution $(v, \pi) \in W^1_{q'}(\Omega)^d \times L_{q'}(\Omega)$ with $(\pi)_\Omega = 0$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} D_\beta(A^{\alpha\beta}_{\mathrm{tr}} D_\alpha v) + \nabla\pi = D_\alpha\eta_\alpha & \text{in } \Omega,\\ \operatorname{div} v = h - (h)_\Omega & \text{in } \Omega,\\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{5.35}$$

where $A_{\text{tr}}^{\alpha\beta}$ is the transpose of the matrix $A^{\alpha\beta}$ for each $\alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, d$. We also have

$$\|Dv\|_{L_{q'}(\Omega)} + \|\pi\|_{L_{q'}(\Omega)} \le N\big(\|\eta_\alpha\|_{L_{q'}(\Omega)} + \|h\|_{L_{q'}(\Omega)}\big), \tag{5.36}$$

where $N = N(d, \delta, R_1, K_1, K, q')$. Now we test (5.35) by u to obtain

$$\int_\Omega \eta_\alpha \cdot D_\alpha u \, dx = \int_\Omega \big(D_\beta u \cdot A_{\text{tr}}^{\alpha\beta} D_\alpha v + \pi \ \text{div}\, u\big) \, dx = \int_\Omega \big(f_\alpha \cdot D_\alpha v - ph + \pi g\big) \, dx.$$

From this and (5.36), we get

$$\left| \int_\Omega \big(\eta_\alpha \cdot D_\alpha u + ph\big) \, dx \right| \le N\big(\|\eta_\alpha\|_{L_{q'}(\Omega)} + \|h\|_{L_{q'}(\Omega)}\big)\big(\|f_\alpha\|_{L_q(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L_q(\Omega)}\big).$$

Since $\eta \in \big(L_{q'}(\Omega)\big)^{d^2}$ and $h \in L_{q'}(\Omega)$ are arbitrary, we obtain (2.4).

For the solvability, for $k > 0$, we consider the equation with

$$f_\alpha^k := \max\{-k, \min\{f_\alpha, k\}\}, \quad g^k := \max\{-k, \min\{g, k\}\} \tag{5.37}$$

in place of f_α and g. Since $f_\alpha^k, g^k \in L_2(\Omega)$, by Lemma 3.4, there is a unique solution $(u_k, p_k) \in \mathring{W}_2^1(\Omega)^d \times L_2(\Omega)$ satisfying $(p_k)_\Omega = 0$ and

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L} u_k + \nabla p_k = D_\alpha f_\alpha^k & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \text{div}\, u_k = g^k - (g^k)_\Omega & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_k = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{5.38}$$

Since Ω is bounded, $(u_k, p_k) \in \mathring{W}_q^1(\Omega)^d \times L_q(\Omega)$. By the a priori estimate, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_k\|_{W_q^1(\Omega)} + \|p_k\|_{L_q(\Omega)} &\le N\|f^k\|_{L_q(\Omega)} + N\|g^k\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \\ &\le N\|f\|_{L_q(\Omega)} + N\|g\|_{L_q(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

By the weak compactness, there is a subsequence (u_{k_j}, p_{k_j}), $u \in \mathring{W}_q^1(\Omega)^d$, and $p \in L_q(\Omega)$ satisfying $(p)_\Omega = 0$, such that

$$u_{k_j} \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{in } W_q^1(\Omega), \quad p_{k_j} \rightharpoonup p \quad \text{in } L_q(\Omega).$$

Taking the limit of the equations of (u_{k_j}, p_{k_j}), it is easily seen that (u, p) satisfies (5.1). In particular, $\text{div}\, u = g$ in Ω because for any $\psi \in L_{q'}(\Omega)$, $1/q + 1/q' = 1$,

$$\int_\Omega \big(g^k - (g^k)_\Omega\big) \, \psi \, dx = \int_\Omega (\text{div}\, u_k) \psi \, dx \to \int_\Omega (\text{div}\, u) \psi \, dx$$

and

$$\int_\Omega \big(g^k - (g^k)_\Omega\big) \, \psi \, dx \to \int_\Omega g \psi \, dx.$$

The uniqueness follows from the a priori estimate (2.4). The theorem is proved. □

6. Weighted case

We consider Ω and the operator $\mathcal{L}$ with general coefficients $A^{\alpha\beta}$ satisfying Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2.

6.1. **Mean oscillation estimates.** In this subsection, we establish mean oscillation estimates for $D_{x'}u$ and U (see (4.2) for the definition of U) in the L_q setting.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $q \in (1,\infty)$, $R > 0$, $c > 1$, and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and let the coefficients $\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta}(x_1)$ of the operator $\mathcal{L}_0$ be measurable in x_1. For any $f_\alpha, g \in L_q(B_{cR}(x_0))$, there exists $(u,p) \in W^1_q(B_R(x_0)) \times L_q(B_R(x_0))$ satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_0 u + \nabla p = D_\alpha f_\alpha & \text{in } B_R(x_0), \\ \operatorname{div} u = g & \text{in } B_R(x_0), \end{cases}$$

and

$$\|Du\|_{L_q(B_R(x_0))} + \|p\|_{L_q(B_R(x_0))} \le N\|f_\alpha\|_{L_q(B_{cR}(x_0))} + N\|g\|_{L_q(B_{cR}(x_0))},$$

where $N = N(d,\delta,c,q)$, but is independent of R.

Proof. See the proof of Lemma 6.2 below. □

Lemma 6.2. *Let $q \in (1,\infty)$, $R > 0$, $c > 1$, and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and let the coefficients $\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta}(x_1)$ of the operator $\mathcal{L}_0$ be measurable in x_1. For any $f_\alpha, g \in L_q(B^+_{cR}(x_0))$, there exists $(u,p) \in W^1_q(B^+_R(x_0)) \times L_q(B^+_R(x_0))$ satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_0 u + \nabla p = D_\alpha f_\alpha & \text{in } B^+_R(x_0), \\ \operatorname{div} u = g & \text{in } B^+_R(x_0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on } B_R(x_0) \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^d_+, \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

and

$$\|Du\|_{L_q(B^+_R(x_0))} + \|p\|_{L_q(B^+_R(x_0))} \le N\|f_\alpha\|_{L_q(B^+_{cR}(x_0))} + N\|g\|_{L_q(B^+_{cR}(x_0))}, \tag{6.2}$$

where $N = N(d,\delta,c,q)$, but is independent of R.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $x_0 = 0$. Set η to be an infinitely differentiable function defined on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\eta(x) = 1 \quad \text{on } B_1, \quad \eta(x) = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{(c+1)/2}.$$

Then, for $R > 0$, set

$$\mathcal{L}_R u = D_\alpha(A^{\alpha\beta}_R D_\beta u),$$

where

$$A^{\alpha\beta}_R(x) = \eta \bar{A}^{\alpha\beta}(Rx_1) + (1-\eta)\Delta.$$

Now, we fix a domain Ω with a smooth boundary such that

$$B^+_{(c+1)/2} \subset \Omega \subset B^+_c, \quad B_{(c+1)/2} \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^d_+ \subset \partial\Omega.$$

For this Ω, find the constant $K_1 = K_1(d,c)$ in Assumption 3.1. Fix $\rho = \rho(d,\delta,c,q)$ in Theorem 2.4 (also see Remark 2.5). We see that $A^{\alpha\beta}_R$ satisfy Assumption 2.2 (ρ) for Ω uniformly in R if the R_1 in Assumption 2.2 is sufficiently small, and R_0 and R_1 in Theorem 2.4 depend only on c. By setting

$$\hat{f}_\alpha(x) = R^{-1} f_\alpha(Rx), \quad \hat{g}(x) = R^{-1} g(Rx),$$

and using Theorem 2.4, we find $(\hat{u},\hat{p}) \in W^1_q(\Omega)^d \times L_q(\Omega)$ satisfying $(\hat{p})_\Omega = 0$,

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_R \hat{u} + \nabla \hat{p} = D_\alpha \hat{f}_\alpha & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} \hat{u} = \hat{g} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \hat{u} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\|D\hat{u}\|_{L_q(\Omega)} + \|\hat{p}\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \le N\|\hat{f}_\alpha\|_{L_q(\Omega)} + N\|\hat{g}\|_{L_q(\Omega)},$$
$$\le N\|\hat{f}_\alpha\|_{L_q(B_c^+)} + N\|\hat{g}\|_{L_q(B_c^+)},$$

where $N = N(d, \delta, c, q)$. Then, we see that $(u, p) \in W_q^1(B_R^+)^d \times L_q(B_R^+)$, where

$$u(x) = R^2\,\hat{u}(x/R) \quad \text{and} \quad p(x) = R\,\hat{p}(x/R)$$

satisfy (6.1) and (6.2). □

Lemma 6.3. *Let $q \in (1, \infty)$, $\mu, \nu \in (1, \infty)$, $1/\mu + 1/\nu = 1$, and $\kappa \ge 4$. Then under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 (ρ), for any $r \in (0, R_1/\kappa]$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and*

$$(u, p) \in W_{q\mu}^1(B_{\kappa r}(x_0))^d \times L_q(B_{\kappa r}(x_0))$$

satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u + \nabla p = D_\alpha f_\alpha & \text{in } B_{\kappa r}(x_0), \\ \operatorname{div} u = g & \text{in } B_{\kappa r}(x_0), \end{cases}$$

where $f_\alpha, g \in L_q(B_{\kappa r}(x_0))$, there exists a (d^2+1)-dimensional vector-valued function $\mathcal{U}$ on $B_{\kappa r}(x_0)$ such that, on $B_{\kappa r}(x_0)$,

$$N^{-1}(|Du| + |p|) \le |\mathcal{U}| \le N(|Du| + |p|) \tag{6.3}$$

and

$$\left(|\mathcal{U} - (\mathcal{U})_{B_r(x_0)}|\right)_{B_r(x_0)} \le N\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(|Du|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{B_{\kappa r}(x_0)}$$
$$+ N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q}}\rho^{\frac{1}{q\nu}} \left(|Du|^{q\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{q\mu}}_{B_{\kappa r}(x_0)} + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q}} \left(|f_\alpha|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{B_{\kappa r}(x_0)} + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q}} \left(|g|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{B_{\kappa r}(x_0)},$$

where $N = N(d, \delta, \mu, q)$.

Proof. We assume that $x_0 = 0$. By Assumption 2.2, there is a coordinate system such that

$$\fint_{B_{\kappa r}} |A^{\alpha\beta}(x_1, x') - \bar{A}^{\alpha\beta}(x_1)|\,dx \le \rho, \tag{6.4}$$

where

$$\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta}(x_1) = \fint_{B'_{\kappa r}} A^{\alpha\beta}(x_1, x')\,dx'.$$

Let $\mathcal{L}_0$ be the elliptic operator with the coefficients $\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta}$. By Lemma 6.1, there exists $(w, p_1) \in W_q^1(B_{\kappa r/2})^d \times L_q(B_{\kappa r/2})$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_0 w + \nabla p_1 = D_\alpha \bar{f}_\alpha & \text{in } B_{\kappa r/2}, \\ \operatorname{div} w = g - (g)_{B_{\kappa r/2}} & \text{in } B_{\kappa r/2}, \end{cases}$$

where $\bar{f}_\alpha = f_\alpha + (\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta} - A^{\alpha\beta})D_\beta u$ and

$$\|Dw\|_{L_q(B_{\kappa r/2})} + \|p_1\|_{L_q(B_{\kappa r/2})} \le N\|\bar{f}_\alpha\|_{L_q(B_{\kappa r})} + N\|g\|_{L_q(B_{\kappa r})}. \tag{6.5}$$

This estimate implies

$$\|Dw\|_{L_q(B_r)} + \|p_1\|_{L_q(B_r)} \le N\left(\|\bar{f}_\alpha\|_{L_q(B_{\kappa r})} + \|g\|_{L_q(B_{\kappa r})}\right), \tag{6.6}$$

where $N = N(d, \delta, q)$. Note that by the boundedness of $A^{\alpha\beta}$, Hölder's inequality, and (6.4), we have

$$\|\bar{f}_\alpha\|_{L_q(B_{\kappa r})} \le \|f_\alpha\|_{L_q(B_{\kappa r})} + N\rho^{1/(q\nu)}(\kappa r)^{d/(q\nu)}\|Du\|_{L_{q\mu}(B_{\kappa r})}, \tag{6.7}$$

where $N = N(\delta, \mu, q)$.

Set $(v, p_2) = (u, p) - (w, p_1)$, which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_0 v + \nabla p_2 = 0 & \text{in } B_{\kappa r/2}, \\ \operatorname{div} v = (g)_{B_{\kappa r/2}} & \text{in } B_{\kappa r/2}. \end{cases}$$

Then, by Lemma 4.2,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(|D_{x'} v - (D_{x'} v)_{B_r}|\right)_{B_r} + \left(|V - (V)_{B_r}|\right)_{B_r} \\ &\le (2r)^{1/2} \left[D_{x'} v\right]_{C^{1/2}(B_r)} + (2r)^{1/2} \left[V\right]_{C^{1/2}(B_r)} \le N \kappa^{-1/2} \left(|Dv|^q\right)^{1/q}_{B_{\kappa r/2}}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

where

$$V_1 = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\beta=1}^d \bar{A}_{1j}^{1\beta} D_\beta v_j + p_2, \quad V_i = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\beta=1}^d \bar{A}_{ij}^{1\beta} D_\beta v_j, \quad i = 2, \dots, d,$$

and $N = N(d, \delta)$. Set

$$\mathcal{U} = (D_{x'} u, \operatorname{div} u, U_1, \dots, U_d), \tag{6.9}$$

where

$$U_1 = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\beta=1}^d \bar{A}_{1j}^{1\beta} D_\beta u_j + p, \quad U_i = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\beta=1}^d \bar{A}_{ij}^{1\beta} D_\beta u_j, \quad i = 2, \dots, d.$$

Then, it follows from the triangle inequality, (6.8), and Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(|\mathcal{U} - (\mathcal{U})_{B_r}|\right)_{B_r} \le N \left(|D_{x'} v - (D_{x'} v)_{B_r}|\right)_{B_r} \\ &+ N \left(|V - (V)_{B_r}|\right)_{B_r} + \left(|g|\right)_{B_r} + N \left(|Dw| + |p_1|\right)_{B_r} \\ &\le N \kappa^{-1/2} \left(|Dv|^q\right)^{1/q}_{B_{\kappa r/2}} + N \kappa^{d/q} \left(|g|^q\right)^{1/q}_{B_{\kappa r/2}} + N \left(|Dw| + |p_1|\right)_{B_r}, \end{aligned}$$

where $N = N(d, \delta)$. Together with the estimates (6.5), (6.6), (6.7), and the fact that $u = v + w$, this shows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(|\mathcal{U} - (\mathcal{U})_{B_r}|\right)_{B_r} \le N \kappa^{-1/2} \left(|Du|^q\right)^{1/q}_{B_{\kappa r}} \\ &+ N \kappa^{d/q} \rho^{1/(q\nu)} \left(|Du|^{q\mu}\right)^{1/(q\mu)}_{B_{\kappa r}} + N \kappa^{d/q} \left(|f_\alpha|^q + |g|^q\right)^{1/q}_{B_{\kappa r}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, it is easy to check (6.3) using the definition of U. The lemma is proved. □

Recall

$$\Omega_r(x_0) = \Omega \cap B_r(x_0).$$

Lemma 6.4. *Let $q \in (1, \infty)$, $\mu, \nu \in (1, \infty)$, $1/\mu + 1/\nu = 1$, and $\kappa \ge 64$. Then, under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 (ρ) such that $\rho\kappa \le 1/4$, for any $r \in (0, R_1/\kappa]$, $x_0 \in \overline{\Omega}$, and*

$$(u, p) \in W^1_{q\mu}(\Omega_{\kappa r}(x_0))^d \times L_{q\mu}(\Omega_{\kappa r}(x_0))$$

satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L} u + \nabla p = D_\alpha f_\alpha & \text{in } \Omega_{\kappa r}(x_0), \\ \operatorname{div} u = g & \text{in } \Omega_{\kappa r}(x_0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B_{\kappa r}(x_0), \end{cases} \tag{6.10}$$

where $f_\alpha \in L_q(\Omega_{\kappa r}(x_0))$, there exists a (d^2+1)-dimensional vector-valued function $\mathcal{U}$ on $\Omega_{\kappa r}(x_0)$ such that, on $\Omega_{\kappa r}(x_0)$,

$$N^{-1}(|Du| + |p|) \le |\mathcal{U}| \le N(|Du| + |p|), \tag{6.11}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\left(|\mathcal{U}-(\mathcal{U})_{\Omega_r(x_0)}|\right)_{\Omega_r(x_0)} &\le N(\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}}+\kappa\rho)\left(|Du|^q+|p|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\Omega_{\kappa r}(x_0)}\\ &+N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q}}\rho^{\frac{1}{q\nu}}\left(|Du|^{q\mu}+|p|^{q\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{q\mu}}_{\Omega_{\kappa r}(x_0)}+N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q}}\left(|f_\alpha|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\Omega_{\kappa r}(x_0)}+N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q}}\left(|g|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\Omega_{\kappa r}(x_0)},\end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

where $N=N(d,\delta,\mu,q)$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{x}\in\partial\Omega$ be such that $|x_0-\tilde{x}|=\operatorname{dist}(x_0,\partial\Omega)$. We consider two cases.
Case 1: $|x_0-\tilde{x}|\ge\kappa r/16$**.** In this case, we have

$$\Omega_r(x_0)=B_r(x_0)\subset B_{\kappa r/16}(x_0)\subset\Omega.$$

Since $\kappa/16\ge 4$, (6.12) follows from Lemma 6.3.
Case 2: $|x_0-\tilde{x}|<\kappa r/16$**.** In this case, the proof is similar to that of Proposition 5.1. Without loss of generality, one may assume that $\tilde{x}$ is the origin. Note that

$$\Omega_r(x_0)\subset\Omega_{\kappa r/4}\subset\Omega_{\kappa r/2}\subset\Omega_{\kappa r}(x_0).$$

Denote $R=\kappa r/2\,(\le R_1/2)$. Due to Assumption 2.2, we can perform an orthogonal transformation to obtain

$$\{(x_1,x'):\rho R<x_1\}\cap B_R\subset\Omega\cap B_R\subset\{(x_1,x'):-\rho R<x_1\}\cap B_R$$

and

$$\fint_{B_R}\left|A^{\alpha\beta}(x_1,x')-\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta}(x_1)\right|\,dx\le\rho, \tag{6.13}$$

where

$$\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta}(x_1)=\fint_{B_R'}A^{\alpha\beta}(x_1,x')\,dx'. \tag{6.14}$$

Take a smooth function χ on $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\chi(x_1)\equiv 0\quad\text{for } x_1\le\rho R,\quad \chi(x_1)\equiv 1\quad\text{for } x_1\ge 2\rho R,\quad\text{and}\quad |\chi'|\le 2(\rho R)^{-1}.$$

Denote $\mathcal{L}_0$ to be the elliptic operator with the coefficients $\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta}$ from (6.14). Let $\hat{u}=\chi u$, which vanishes on $B_R\cap\{x_1\le\rho R\}$. From (6.10), it is easily seen that $(\hat{u},p)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases}\mathcal{L}_0\hat{u}+\nabla p=D_\alpha(\tilde{f}_\alpha+h_\alpha) & \text{in } B_R\cap\{x_1>\rho R\},\\ \operatorname{div}\hat{u}=\chi g+\chi' u_1 & \text{in } B_R\cap\{x_1>\rho R\},\\ \hat{u}=0 & \text{on } B_R\cap\{x_1=\rho R\},\end{cases} \tag{6.15}$$

where

$$\tilde{f}_\alpha=f_\alpha+(\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta}-A^{\alpha\beta})D_\beta u\quad\text{and}\quad h_\alpha=\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta}D^\beta((\chi-1)u).$$

For $\tau\in[0,\infty)$, set

$$\widetilde{B}_r^+(\tau,0)=B_r(\tau,0)\cap\{x_1>\tau\},$$

where $0\in\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Since $\rho\in(0,1/16)$, we have

$$\Omega_{R/2}\subset\Omega_{3R/4}(\rho R,0)\quad\text{and}\quad\widetilde{B}^+_{3R/4}(\rho R,0)\subset\widetilde{B}^+_{7R/8}(\rho R,0)\subset B_R\cap\{x_1>\rho R\}.$$

By Lemma 6.2, there exists

$$(\hat{w},\hat{p}_1)\in W^1_q(\widetilde{B}^+_{3R/4}(\rho R,0))^d\times L_q(\widetilde{B}^+_{3R/4}(\rho R,0))$$

satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_0\hat{w} + \nabla\hat{p}_1 = D_\alpha(\tilde{f}_\alpha + h_\alpha) & \text{in } \widetilde{B}^+_{3R/4}(\rho R, 0), \\ \operatorname{div}\hat{w} = \chi g + \chi' u_1 - \left(\chi g + \chi' u_1\right)_{\widetilde{B}^+_{3R/4}(\rho R,0)} & \text{in } \widetilde{B}^+_{3R/4}(\rho R, 0), \\ \hat{w} = 0 & \text{on } B_{3R/4}(\rho R, 0) \cap \{x_1 = \rho R\}, \end{cases} \tag{6.16}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D\hat{w}\|_{L_q(\widetilde{B}^+_{3R/4}(\rho R,0))} + \|\hat{p}_1\|_{L_q(\widetilde{B}^+_{3R/4}(\rho R,0))} \\ &\le N\|\tilde{f}_\alpha\|_{L_q(\mathcal{D})} + N\|h_\alpha\|_{L_q(\mathcal{D})} + N\|\chi g + \chi' u\|_{L_q(\mathcal{D})} \\ &\le N\|f_\alpha\|_{L_q(\mathcal{D})} + N\|(\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta} - A^{\alpha\beta})D_\beta u\|_{L_q(\mathcal{D})} \\ &\quad + N\|D((\chi-1)u)\|_{L_q(\mathcal{D})} + N\|g\|_{L_q(\mathcal{D})} + N\|\chi' u\|_{L_q(\mathcal{D})}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.17}$$

where $\mathcal{D} = \widetilde{B}^+_{7R/8}(\rho R, 0)$ and $N = N(d, \delta, q)$. Using the fact that $|A^{\alpha\beta}| \le \delta^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{D} \subset B_R$ together with (6.13) and Hölder's inequality, it follows that

$$\|(\bar{A}^{\alpha\beta} - A^{\alpha\beta})D_\beta u\|_{L_q(\mathcal{D})} \le N\rho^{\frac{1}{q\nu}} R^{\frac{d}{q\nu}} \|Du\|_{L_{q\mu}(\mathcal{D})}. \tag{6.18}$$

Since $\chi - 1$ is supported on $\{x_1 \le 2\rho R\}$, Hölder's inequality implies that

$$\|(\chi-1)Du\|_{L_q(\mathcal{D})} \le N\rho^{\frac{1}{q\nu}} R^{\frac{d}{q\nu}} \|Du\|_{L_{q\mu}(\Omega_R)}. \tag{6.19}$$

Using Hölder's inequality again, together with the fact that χ' is supported on $\{\rho R \le x_1 \le 2\rho R\}$, we have

$$\|\chi' u\|_{L_q(\mathcal{D})} \le N\rho^{\frac{1}{q\nu}} R^{\frac{d}{q\nu}} \|\chi' u\|_{L_{q\mu}(\mathcal{D})} \le N\rho^{\frac{1}{q\nu}} R^{\frac{d}{q\nu}} \|Du\|_{L_{q\mu}(\Omega_R)}. \tag{6.20}$$

Note that in the last inequality above we used Hardy's inequality, the boundary condition $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, and the observation that

$$|\chi'| \le N(x_1 - \phi(x'))^{-1}$$

for $(x_1, x') \in \Omega_R$, where $\phi(x')$ is the largest number such that $(\phi(x'), x') \in \partial\Omega$. The inequalities (6.18), (6.19), and (6.20), together with (6.17), imply that

$$(|D\hat{w}|^q + |\hat{p}_1|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\widetilde{B}^+_{3R/4}(\rho R,0)} \le N\rho^{\frac{1}{q\nu}} (|Du|^{q\mu})^{\frac{1}{q\mu}}_{\Omega_R} + N(|f_\alpha|^q + |g|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\Omega_R}. \tag{6.21}$$

We extend $\hat{w}$ to be zero in $\Omega_{3R/4}(\rho R, 0) \cap \{x_1 < \rho R\}$, so that $\hat{w} \in W^1_2(\Omega_{3R/4}(\rho R, 0))$, and we let

$$w = \hat{w} + (1 - \chi)u.$$

We also set

$$p_1 = \begin{cases} \hat{p}_1 & \text{in } \tilde{B}^+_{3R/4}(\rho R, 0), \\ p & \text{in } \Omega_{3R/4}(\rho R, 0) \cap \{x_1 \rho R\}. \end{cases}$$

By the same reasoning as in (6.19) and (6.20), we have

$$\|D\left((1-\chi)u\right)\|_{L_q(\Omega_{3R/4}(\rho R,0))} \le N\rho^{\frac{1}{q\nu}} R^{\frac{d}{q\nu}} \|Du\|_{L_{q\mu}(\Omega_R)},$$

and

$$\|p_1\|_{L_q(\Omega_{3R/4}(\rho R,0))} \le \|\hat{p}_1\|_{L_q(\tilde{B}^+_{3R/4}(\rho R,0))} + N\rho^{\frac{1}{q\nu}} R^{\frac{d}{q\nu}} \|p\|_{L_{q\mu}(\Omega_R)}.$$

From these inequalities and (6.21), we deduce that

$$(|Dw|^q + |p_1|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\Omega_{3R/4}(\rho R,0)} \le N\rho^{\frac{1}{q\nu}} (|Du|^{q\mu} + |p|^{q\mu})^{\frac{1}{q\mu}}_{\Omega_R} + N(|f_\alpha|^q + |g|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\Omega_R}. \tag{6.22}$$

Note that, because $\kappa\rho \le 1/4$, it holds that

$$\Omega_r(x_0) \subset \Omega_{3R/4}(\rho R, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad |\Omega_{3R/4}(\rho R,0)|/|\Omega_r(x_0)| \le N(d)\kappa^d.$$

Thus, from (6.22) we also obtain that

$$(|Dw|^q + |p_1|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\Omega_r(x_0)} \le N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q}}\rho^{\frac{1}{q\nu}}(|Du|^{q\mu} + |p|^{q\mu})^{\frac{1}{q\mu}}_{\Omega_R} + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q}}(|f_\alpha|^q + |g|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\Omega_R}. \quad (6.23)$$

Next, we set $v = u - w$ $(= \chi u - \hat{w})$ and $p_2 = p - p_1$ in $\Omega_{3R/4}(\rho R, 0)$. From (6.15) and (6.16), it is easily seen that (v, p_2) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_0 v + \nabla p_2 = 0 & \text{in } \widetilde{B}^+_{3R/4}(\rho R, 0), \\ \operatorname{div} v = \big(\chi g + \chi' u_1\big)_{\widetilde{B}^+_{3R/4}(\rho R,0)} & \text{in } \widetilde{B}^+_{3R/4}(\rho R, 0), \\ v = 0 & \text{on } B_{3R/4}(\rho R, 0) \cap \{x_1 = \rho R\}. \end{cases}$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{D}_1 = \Omega_r(x_0) \cap \{x_1 \le \rho R\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_2 = \Omega_r(x_0) \cap \{x_1 > \rho R\}, \quad \text{and } \mathcal{D}_3 = \widetilde{B}^+_{R/4}(\rho R, 0).$$

We see that $\mathcal{D}_2 \subset \mathcal{D}_3$ and $|\mathcal{D}_1| \le N\kappa\rho|\Omega_r(x_0)|$, where the latter follows from the fact that $\mathcal{D}_1 = \Omega_r(x_0) \cap \{-\rho R \le x_1 \le \rho R\}$. We set

$$V_1 = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\beta=1}^d \bar{A}^{1\beta}_{1j} D_\beta v_j + p_2, \quad V_i = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\beta=1}^d \bar{A}^{1\beta}_{ij} D_\beta v_j, \quad i = 2, \dots, d,$$

where the coefficients $\bar{A}^{1\beta}(x_1)$ are taken from (6.14). Note that $v = V = 0$ in $\mathcal{D}_1$. Then, by applying Lemma 4.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\big(|V - (V)_{\Omega_r(x_0)}|\big)_{\Omega_r(x_0)} + \big(|D_{x'}v - (D_{x'}v)_{\Omega_r(x_0)}|\big)_{\Omega_r(x_0)} \\ &\le N r^{\frac{1}{2}}\big([V]_{C^{1/2}(\mathcal{D}_2)} + [D_{x'}v]_{C^{1/2}(\mathcal{D}_2)}\big) + N\kappa\rho\big(\|V\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{D}_2)} + \|D_{x'}v\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{D}_2)}\big) \\ &\le N r^{\frac{1}{2}}\big([V]_{C^{1/2}(\mathcal{D}_3)} + [D_{x'}v]_{C^{1/2}(\mathcal{D}_3)}\big) + N\kappa\rho\big(\|V\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{D}_3)} + \|D_{x'}v\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{D}_3)}\big) \\ &\le N(\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \kappa\rho)(|Dv|^q + |p_2|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\widetilde{B}^+_{R/2}(\rho R,0)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.24)$$

Now, we define $\mathcal{U} = (D_{x'}u, \operatorname{div} u, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_d)$ as in (6.9). Note that $\mathcal{U}$ satisfies (6.11). From the triangle inequality and (6.24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \big(|\mathcal{U} - (\mathcal{U})_{\Omega_r(x_0)}|\big)_{\Omega_r(x_0)} &\le N\big(|D_{x'}v - (D_{x'}v)_{\Omega_r(x_0)}|\big)_{\Omega_r(x_0)} \\ &\quad + N\big(|V - (V)_{\Omega_r(x_0)}|\big)_{\Omega_r(x_0)} + N(|g| + |Dw| + |p_1|)_{\Omega_r(x_0)} \\ &\le N(\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \kappa\rho)(|Dv|^q + |p_2|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\widetilde{B}^+_{R/2}(\rho R,0)} + N(|g|^q + |Dw|^q + |p_1|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\Omega_r(x_0)}. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the terms on the right-hand side of the last inequality above, we note the following. First, by the fact that $u = w + v$ and $p = p_1 + p_2$, and (6.22) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (|Dv|^q + |p_2|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\widetilde{B}^+_{R/2}(\rho R,0)} &\le (|Du|^q + |p|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\widetilde{B}^+_{R/2}(\rho R,0)} + (|Dw|^q + |p_1|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\widetilde{B}^+_{R/2}(\rho R,0)} \\ &\le N(|Du|^q + |p|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\Omega_R} + N\rho^{\frac{1}{q\nu}}(|Du|^{q\mu} + |p|^{q\mu})^{\frac{1}{q\mu}}_{\Omega_R} + N(|f_\alpha|^q + |g|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\Omega_R}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we use (6.23) and the fact that $|\Omega_R| \le N\kappa^d|\Omega_r(x_0)|$ by the condition $\kappa\rho \le 1/4$ to obtain

$$(|g|^q + |Dw|^q + |p_1|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\Omega_r(x_0)} \le N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q}}\rho^{\frac{1}{q\nu}}(|Du|^{q\mu} + |p|^{q\mu})^{\frac{1}{q\mu}}_{\Omega_R} + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q}}\left(|f_\alpha|^q + |g|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\Omega_R}.$$

Combining the inequalities above, we get

$$\left(|\mathcal{U}-(\mathcal{U})_{\Omega_r(x_0)}|\right)_{\Omega_r(x_0)} \le N(\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}}+\kappa\rho)(|Du|^q+|p|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\Omega_R}$$

$$+N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q}}\rho^{\frac{1}{q\nu}}(|Du|^{q\mu}+|p|^{q\mu})^{\frac{1}{q\mu}}_{\Omega_R}+N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q}}\left(|f_\alpha|^q+|g|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}_{\Omega_R}.$$

Since $\Omega_R=\Omega_{\kappa r/2}\subset\Omega_{\kappa r}(x_0)$ and the volumes of these two sets are comparable, we finally obtain (6.12). The lemma is proved. □

6.2. **Proofs of Theorems 2.6 and 2.7.** First we note that a bounded Reifenberg flat domain is a space of homogeneous type, see [11, Remark 7.3], which is endowed with the Euclidean distance and a doubling measure μ that is naturally inherited from the Lebesgue measure. From a result in Christ [8, Theorem 11], there exists a filtration of partitions of Ω in the following sense. For each $n\in\mathbb{Z}$, there exists a collection of disjoint open subsets $\mathbb{C}_n:=\{Q^n_\alpha\,:\,\alpha\in I_n\}$ for some index set I_n, satisfying the following properties:

(1) For any $n\in\mathbb{Z}$, $\mu(\Omega\setminus\bigcup_\alpha Q^n_\alpha)=0$;
(2) For each n and $\alpha\in I_n$, there exists a unique $\beta\in I_{n-1}$ such that $Q^n_\alpha\subset Q^{n-1}_\beta$;
(3) For each n and $\alpha\in I_n$, $\operatorname{diam}(Q^n_\alpha)\le N_0\delta_0^n$;
(4) Each Q^n_α contains some ball $B_{\varepsilon_0\delta_0^n}(z^n_\alpha)$;

for some constants $\delta_0\in(0,1)$, $\varepsilon_0>0$, and N_0 depending only on d, R_0, and K.

We also use the following filtration of partitions of $\mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\mathbb{C}_n:=\{C_n=C_n(i_1,\dots,i_d):(i_1,\dots,i_d)\in\mathbb{Z}^d\},$$

where $n\in\mathbb{Z}$ and

$$C_n(i_1,\dots,i_d)=[i_12^{-n},(i_1+1)2^{-n}).$$

For a filtration of partitions of $\mathbb{R}^d_+$, we replace $i_1\in\mathbb{Z}$ by $i_1\in\{0,1,2,\dots,\}$.

The following lemma is proved in [11, Theorem 2.4], which is in the spirit of [23, Theorem 2.7].

Lemma 6.5. *Let $q\in(1,\infty)$, $\omega\in A_q$, and Ω be either $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbb{R}^d_+$, or a bounded Reifenberg flat domain as in Theorem 2.7. Suppose that*

$$\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{h}\in L_{q,\omega}(\Omega),\quad |\mathfrak{f}|\le\mathfrak{h},$$

and for each $n\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $Q\in\mathbb{C}_n$, there exists a measurable function $\mathfrak{f}^Q$ on Q such that $|\mathfrak{f}|\le\mathfrak{f}^Q\le\mathfrak{h}$ on Q and

$$\fint_Q|\mathfrak{f}^Q(x)-\left(\mathfrak{f}^Q\right)_Q|\,dx\le N_0\mathfrak{g}(y)\quad\forall\,y\in Q \tag{6.25}$$

for some constant $N_0>0$.

(i) When $\Omega=\mathbb{R}^d$ or $\mathbb{R}^d_+$, we have

$$\|\mathfrak{f}\|^q_{L_{q,\omega}}\le NN_0\|\mathfrak{g}\|^\beta_{L_{q,\omega}}\|\mathfrak{h}\|^{q-\beta}_{L_{q,\omega}},$$

where $\beta\in(0,1]$ and $N>0$ are constants depending only on d, q, and $[\omega]_{A_q}$.

(ii) Otherwise, we have

$$\|\mathfrak{f}\|^q_{L_{q,\omega}}\le NN_0\|\mathfrak{g}\|^\beta_{L_{q,\omega}}\|\mathfrak{h}\|^{q-\beta}_{L_{q,\omega}}+N_1\|\mathfrak{h}\|^q_{L_1},$$

where $\beta\in(0,1]$ and $N>0$ are constants depending only on d, q, R_0, K, and $[\omega]_{A_q}$, and N_1 depends only on $\omega(\Omega)$ and the same parameters as N.

Proof of Theorem 2.6. We only treat the case when $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d_+$, as the whole space case is similar. By the reverse Hölder's inequality for A_q weights, we have $\omega \in A_{\tilde{q}}$ for some $\tilde{q} \in (1, q)$ which depends on d, q, and $[\omega]_{A_q}$. Let $q_0 = q/\tilde{q} \in (1, q)$. Then clearly, for any function $f \in L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)$, we have $|f|^{q_0} \in L_{\tilde{q},\omega}(\Omega)$, and by Lemma 3.1 of [10], $f \in L_{q_0,\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$.

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$ and $C_n \in \mathbb{C}_n$ such that $x \in C_n$, find $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$ and the smallest $r \in (0, \infty)$ (indeed, $r = 2^{-n-1}\sqrt{d}$) satisfying $C_n \subset B_r(x_0)$ and

$$\fint_{C_n} |h(x) - (h)_{C_n}| \, dx \le N(d) \fint_{B_r(x_0)} |h(x) - (h)_{B_r(x_0)}| \, dx. \tag{6.26}$$

Under the conditions of the theorem, Assumption 2.2 is satisfied with $\rho = 0$ and $R_1 = \infty$. Since $(u, p) \in W^1_{q_0}(\Omega^+_{\kappa r}(x_0))^d \times L_{q_0}(B^+_{\kappa r}(x_0))$, it follows from Lemma 6.4 that for any $\kappa \ge 64$ and $r > 0$, (6.12) holds with q replaced by q_0 and $\rho = 0$, where $\mathcal{U}$ is a function defined on C_n and satisfies (6.11). Clearly, each term in the right-hand side of (6.12) is bounded by its maximal function at x. From this and (6.26), we have

$$(|\mathcal{U} - (\mathcal{U})_{C_n}|)_{C_n} \le N\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathcal{M}(|Du|^{q_0} + |p|^{q_0})(x)\right)^{\frac{1}{q_0}} + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}} \left(\mathcal{M}(F^{q_0})(x)\right)^{\frac{1}{q_0}}$$

for $x \in C_n$ and $\kappa \ge 64$, where $N = N(d, \delta, q_0)$ and $F = |f_\alpha| + |g|$. Recall the inequality (6.11). Applying Lemma 6.5 (i) with $\mathfrak{f} = N^{-1}(|Du| + |p|)$, $\mathfrak{h} = N(|Du| + |p|)$, and

$$\mathfrak{g} = \kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathcal{M}(|Du|^{q_0} + |p|^{q_0})(x)\right)^{\frac{1}{q_0}} + \kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}} \left(\mathcal{M}(F^{q_0})(x)\right)^{\frac{1}{q_0}},$$

and using the maximal function theorem with A_p weights (see, for instance, [3]) on the above pointwise estimate, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|Du\|_{L_{q,\omega}} + \|p\|_{L_{q,\omega}} \\
&\le N\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \left(\mathcal{M}(|Du|^{q_0} + |p|^{q_0})\right)^{\frac{1}{q_0}} \right\|_{L_{q,\omega}} + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}} \left\| \left(\mathcal{M}(F^{q_0})\right)^{\frac{1}{q_0}} \right\|_{L_{q,\omega}} \\
&= N\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \mathcal{M}(|Du|^{q_0} + |p|^{q_0}) \right\|^{\frac{1}{q_0}}_{L_{\tilde{q},\omega}} + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}} \left\| \mathcal{M}(F^{q_0}) \right\|^{\frac{1}{q_0}}_{L_{\tilde{q},\omega}} \\
&\le N\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\| |Du|^{q_0} + |p|^{q_0} \right\|^{\frac{1}{q_0}}_{L_{\tilde{q},\omega}} + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}} \left\| F^{q_0} \right\|^{\frac{1}{q_0}}_{L_{\tilde{q},\omega}} \\
&\le N\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\|Du\|_{L_{q,\omega}} + \|p\|_{L_{q,\omega}} \right) + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}} \left(\|f_\alpha\|_{L_{q,\omega}} + \|g\|_{L_{q,\omega}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $L_{q,\omega} = L_{q,\omega}(\mathbb{R}^d_+)$ and $N = N(d, \delta, q, [\omega]_{A_q})$. Upon taking a sufficiently large $\kappa \ge 64$, which depends only on d, δ, q, and $[\omega]_{A_q}$ such that $N\kappa^{-1/2} \le 1/2$, we arrive at (2.6). The theorem is proved. □

Proof of Theorem 2.7. As in the proof of Theorem 2.6, we have $\omega \in A_{\tilde{q}}$ for some $\tilde{q} \in (1, q)$ which depends on d, q, R_0, K, and $[\omega]_{A_q}$. Let $q_0 = \mu = (q/\tilde{q})^{1/2} \in (1, q^{1/2})$. Then, for any function $f \in L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)$, we have

$$|f|^{q_0\mu} \in L_{\tilde{q},\omega}(\Omega), \quad |f|^{q_0} \in L_{\tilde{q}\mu,\omega}(\Omega),$$

and by Lemma 3.1 of [10], $f \in L_{q_0\mu}(\Omega)$. We first prove the a priori estimate (2.8). Let $(u, p) \in W^1_{q,\omega}(\Omega)^d \times L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)$ be a solution to (2.7) satisfying $(p)_\Omega = 0$. Then, $(u, p) \in W^1_{q_0\mu}(\Omega)^d \times L_{q_0\mu}(\Omega)$.

By the properties (3) and (4) stated before Lemma 6.5, for each $Q \in \mathbb{C}_n$ in the partitions, there exist $r \in (0,\infty)$ and $x_0 \in \bar{\Omega}$ such that

$$Q \subset \Omega_r(x_0) \quad \text{and} \quad |\Omega_r(x_0)| \le N|Q|, \tag{6.27}$$

where N depends on d, R_0, and K. To apply Lemma 6.5 (ii), we take

$$\mathfrak{f} = N^{-1}(|Du| + |p|), \quad \mathfrak{h} = N(|Du| + |p|),$$

where $N = N(d,\delta,\mu,q_0) = N(d,\delta,R_0,K,q,[\omega]_{A_q})$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{g}(y) &= (\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \kappa\rho)\left[\mathcal{M}(|Du|^{q_0} + |p|^{q_0})(y)\right]^{\frac{1}{q_0}} + \kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}}\left[\mathcal{M}(F^{q_0})(y)\right]^{\frac{1}{q_0}} \\ &\quad + \kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}}\rho^{\frac{1}{q_0\nu}}\left[\mathcal{M}(|Du|^{q_0\mu} + |p|^{q_0\mu})(y)\right]^{\frac{1}{q_0\mu}} + R_1^{-d}\kappa^d \left\||Du| + |p|\right\|_{L_1(\Omega)},\end{aligned}$$

where $F = |f_\alpha| + |g|$. For $\mathfrak{f}^Q$, we consider two cases. When $\kappa r \le R_1$, we choose $\mathfrak{f}^Q = \mathcal{U}$, where $\mathcal{U}$ is from Lemma 6.4. Thanks to (6.11), (6.12) with q replaced by q_0, and (6.27), we have that (6.25) holds. Otherwise, i.e., if $r > R_1/\kappa$, we take $\mathfrak{f}^Q = |Du| + |p|$. Then, by (6.27), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\fint_Q |\mathfrak{f}^Q(x) - (\mathfrak{f}^Q)_Q|\,dx &\le N \fint_{\Omega_r(x_0)} |Du| + |p|\,dx \\ &\le N|\Omega_{R_1/\kappa}(x_0)|^{-1}\left\||Du| + |p|\right\|_{L_1(\Omega)}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $|\Omega_{R_1/\kappa}(x_0)|^{-1} \le NR_1^{-d}\kappa^d$, we still get that (6.25) holds. Therefore, the conditions in Lemma 6.5 are satisfied, which yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\|Du\|_{L_{q,\omega}} + \|p\|_{L_{q,\omega}} \le N\|\mathfrak{g}\|_{L_{q,\omega}} + N_1\left\||Du| + |p|\right\|_{L_1} \\ &\le N_1R_1^{-d}\kappa^d\left\||Du| + |p|\right\|_{L_1} + N(\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \kappa\rho)\|\mathcal{M}(|Du|^{q_0} + |p|^{q_0})^{\frac{1}{q_0}}\|_{L_{q,\omega}} \\ &\quad + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}}\|\mathcal{M}(F^{q_0})^{\frac{1}{q_0}}\|_{L_{q,\omega}} + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}}\rho^{\frac{1}{q_0\nu}}\|\mathcal{M}(|Du|^{q_0\mu} + |p|^{q_0\mu})^{\frac{1}{q_0\mu}}\|_{L_{q,\omega}} \\ &= N_1R_1^{-d}\kappa^d\||Du| + |p|\|_{L_1} + N(\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \kappa\rho)\|\mathcal{M}(|Du|^{q_0} + |p|^{q_0})\|^{\frac{1}{q_0}}_{L_{q/q_0,\omega}} \\ &\quad + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}}\|\mathcal{M}(F^{q_0})\|^{\frac{1}{q_0}}_{L_{q/q_0,\omega}} + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}}\rho^{\frac{1}{q_0\nu}}\|\mathcal{M}(|Du|^{q_0\mu} + |p|^{q_0\mu})\|^{\frac{1}{q_0\mu}}_{L_{q/q_0\mu,\omega}},\end{aligned}$$

where $N = N(d,\delta,R_0,K,q,[\omega]_{A_q})$ and $N_1 = N(d,\delta,R_0,K,q,[\omega]_{A_q},\omega(\Omega))$. By the weighted maximal function theorem (see, for instance, [3]), the right-hand side above is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}&N_1R_1^{-d}\kappa^d\||Du| + |p|\|_{L_1} + N(\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \kappa\rho)\||Du|^{q_0} + |p|^{q_0}\|^{\frac{1}{q_0}}_{L_{q/q_0,\omega}} \\ &\quad + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}}\|F^{q_0}\|^{\frac{1}{q_0}}_{L_{q/q_0}} + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}}\rho^{\frac{1}{q_0\nu}}\||Du|^{q_0\mu} + |p|^{q_0\mu}\|^{\frac{1}{q_0\mu}}_{L_{q/q_0\mu}} \\ &= N_1R_1^{-d}\kappa^d\||Du| + |p|\|_{L_1} + N(\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \kappa\rho)\||Du| + |p|\|_{L_{q,\omega}} \\ &\quad + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}}\|F\|_{L_{q,\omega}} + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}}\rho^{\frac{1}{q_0\nu}}\||Du| + |p|\|_{L_{q,\omega}},\end{aligned}$$

where $N = N(d,\delta,R_0,K,q,[\omega]_{A_q}) > 0$ and $N_1 = N_1(d,\delta,R_0,K,q,[\omega]_{A_q},\omega(\Omega)) > 0$. Upon taking a sufficiently large κ, then a sufficiently small ρ, depending on d, δ, R_0, K, q, and $[\omega]_{A_q}$, so that

$$N(\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \kappa\rho) + N\kappa^{\frac{d}{q_0}}\rho^{\frac{1}{q_0\nu}} \le 1/2,$$

we get

$$\|Du\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)} \le N\|Du\|_{L_1(\Omega)} + N\|f_\alpha\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)} + N\|g\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)}, \tag{6.28}$$

where $N = N(d, \delta, R_0, R_1, K, q, [\omega]_{A_q}, \omega(\Omega)) > 0$. To bound the first term on the right-hand side, we notice that since Ω is bounded, $f_\alpha, g \in L_{q_0}(\Omega)$ and

$$\|f_\alpha\|_{L_{q_0}(\Omega)} \le N\|f_\alpha\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)}, \quad \|g\|_{L_{q_0}(\Omega)} \le N\|g\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)}.$$

Thus, by Theorem 2.4,

$$\|Du\|_{L_{q_0}(\Omega)} + \|p\|_{L_{q_0}(\Omega)} \le N\|f_\alpha\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)} + N\|g\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)},$$

where $N = N(d, \delta, R_0, R_1, K, q_0)$, provided that ρ is sufficiently small depending only on d, δ, R_0, K, and q_0. Combining this with (6.28) yields the desired estimate (2.8).

Next, we prove the solvability. By reverse Hölder's inequality for A_p weights in spaces of homogeneous type proved in [27, Theorem 3.2], we have $\omega \in L_{1+\varepsilon}(\Omega)$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ depends only on d, R_0, K, q, and $[\omega]_{A_q}$. Set $q_1 = q/\varepsilon + q$. Then, by Hölder's inequality, it is easily seen that for any $f \in L_{q_1}(\Omega)$, we have $f \in L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)$ and

$$\|f\|_{L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)} \le N\|f\|_{L_{q_1}(\Omega)},$$

where $N = N(d, R_0, K, q, [\omega]_{A_q}, \omega(\Omega)) > 0$. For $k > 0$, define f_α^k and g^k as in (5.37). Since Ω is bounded, we have

$$f_\alpha^k,\, g^k \in L_\infty(\Omega) \subset L_{q_1}(\Omega).$$

Then, by Theorem 2.4, there is a unique solution $(u_k, p_k) \in W^1_{q_1}(\Omega)^d \times L_{q_1}(\Omega)$ satisfying $(p_k)_\Omega = 0$ and (5.38). Thus, by the reasoning above, we have $(u_k, p_k) \in W^1_{q,\omega}(\Omega)^d \times L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)$. As $f_\alpha, g \in L_{q_0}(\Omega)$, we have $|f_\alpha|, |g| < \infty$ a.e. in Ω. By the dominated convergence theorem, it is easily seen that

$$f_\alpha^k \to f_\alpha, \quad g^k \to g \quad \text{in} \quad L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)$$

as $k \to \infty$. Moreover, $(g^k)_\Omega \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Therefore, by (2.8), $\{(u_k, p_k)\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathring{W}^1_{q,\omega}(\Omega)^d \times L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)$. Let $(u, p) \in \mathring{W}^1_{q,\omega}(\Omega)^d \times L_{q,\omega}(\Omega)$ be the limit of the sequence. Following the last part of the proof of Theorem 2.4, we see that (u, p) satisfies (2.7) and $(p)_\Omega = 0$. Finally, the uniqueness follows from the a priori estimate (2.8). The theorem is proved. □

References

[1] H. Abidi, G. Gui, and P. Zhang. On the decay and stability of global solutions to the 3D inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*,64(6):832–881, 2011.

[2] Gabriel Acosta, Ricardo G. Durán, and María A. Muschietti. Solutions of the divergence operator on John domains. *Adv. Math.*, 206(2):373–401, 2006.

[3] Hugo Aimar and Roberto A. Macías. Weighted norm inequalities for the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator on spaces of homogeneous type. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 91(2):213–216, 1984.

[4] Jonas Azzam, Steve Hofmann, José María Martell, Kaj Nyström, and Tatiana Toro. A new characterization of chord-arc domains. *arXiv:1406.2743*.

[5] M. Bulíček, J. Málek, and K. R. Rajagopal. Navier's slip and evolutionary Navier-Stokes-like systems with pressure and shear-rate dependent viscosity. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 56(1):51–85, 2007.

[6] Sun-Sig Byun and Hyoungsuk So. Weighted estimates for generalized steady Stokes systems in nonsmooth domains. *arXiv:1609.03290*.

[7] Jongkeun Choi and Ki-Ahm Lee. The green function for the stokes system with measurable coefficients. *arXiv:1503.07290*.

[8] Michael Christ. A $T(b)$ theorem with remarks on analytic capacity and the Cauchy integral. *Colloq. Math.*, 60/61(2):601–628, 1990.

[9] M. Dindoš and M. Mitrea. The stationary Navier-Stokes system in nonsmooth manifolds: the Poisson problem in Lipschitz and C^1 domains. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 174(1):1–47, 2004.
[10] Hongjie Dong and Doyoon Kim. L_q-estimates for stationary stokes system with coefficients measurable in one direction. *arXiv:1604.02690*.
[11] Hongjie Dong and Doyoon Kim. On L_p-estimates for elliptic and parabolic equations with A_p weights. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (to appear), arXiv:1603.07844*.
[12] Hongjie Dong and Doyoon Kim. Higher order elliptic and parabolic systems with variably partially BMO coefficients in regular and irregular domains. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 261(11):3279–3327, 2011.
[13] Hongjie Dong and Doyoon Kim. On the L_p-solvability of higher order parabolic and elliptic systems with BMO coefficients. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 199(3):889–941, 2011.
[14] Hongjie Dong and Doyoon Kim. Parabolic and elliptic systems in divergence form with variably partially BMO coefficients. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 43(3):1075–1098, 2011.
[15] Hongjie Dong and Doyoon Kim. On the impossibility of W^2_p estimates for elliptic equations with piecewise constant coefficients. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 267(10):3963–3974, 2014.
[16] E. B. Fabes, C. E. Kenig, and G. C. Verchota. The Dirichlet problem for the Stokes system on Lipschitz domains. *Duke Math. J.*, 57(3):769–793, 1988.
[17] M. Franta, J. Málek, K. R. Rajagopal. On steady flows of fluids with pressure- and shear-dependent viscosities. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, 461(2055):651–670, 2005.
[18] G. P. Galdi, C. G. Simader, and H. Sohr. On the Stokes problem in Lipschitz domains. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 167:147–163, 1994.
[19] M. Giaquinta and G. Modica. Nonlinear systems of the type of the stationary Navier-Stokes system. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 330:173–214, 1982.
[20] Mariano Giaquinta. *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations and nonlinear elliptic systems*, volume 105 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1983.
[21] David Jerison and Carlos E. Kenig. The inhomogeneous Dirichlet problem in Lipschitz domains. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 130(1):161–219, 1995.
[22] Carlos E. Kenig and Tatiana Toro. Harmonic measure on locally flat domains. *Duke Math. J.*, 87(3):509–551, 1997.
[23] N. V. Krylov. Second-order elliptic equations with variably partially VMO coefficients. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 257(6):1695–1712, 2009.
[24] N. V. Krylov and M. V. Safonov. A property of the solutions of parabolic equations with measurable coefficients. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 44(1):161–175, 239, 1980.
[25] O. A. Ladyženskaya and V. A. Solonnikov. The unique solvability of an initial-boundary value problem for viscous incompressible inhomogeneous fluids. Boundary value problems of mathematical physics, and related questions of the theory of functions, 8. *Zap. Naučn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)*, 52:52–109, 218–219, (1975).
[26] Pierre-Louis Lions, *Mathematical topics in fluid mechanics. Vol. 1.* Incompressible models. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, 3. Oxford Science Publications. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1996. xiv+237 pp.
[27] Roberto A. Macías and Carlos A. Segovia. *A well behaved quasi-distance for spaces of homogeneous type*, volume 32 of *Trabajos de Matemática*. Inst. Argentino Mat., 1981.
[28] Norman G. Meyers. An L^p-estimate for the gradient of solutions of second order elliptic divergence equations. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (3)*, 17:189–206, 1963.
[29] Roberto Monti and Daniele Morbidelli. Regular domains in homogeneous groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 357(8):2975–3011, 2005.
[30] M. V. Safonov. Harnack's inequality for elliptic equations and Hölder property of their solutions. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)*, 96:272–287, 312, 1980. Boundary value problems of mathematical physics and related questions in the theory of functions, 12.

(H. Dong) Division of Applied Mathematics, Brown University, 182 George Street, Providence, RI 02912, USA
E-mail address: Hongjie_Dong@brown.edu

(D. Kim) Department of Mathematics, Korea University, 145 Anam-ro, Seongbuk-gu, Seoul, 02841, Republic of Korea
E-mail address: doyoon_kim@korea.ac.kr